

THE
British Critic,
QUARTERLY THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

No. VI.—APR. 1828.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

DEBRETTS'S PEERAGE, WITH THE NEW PEERS, AND
NEW PLATES ELEGANTLY ENGRAVED.

This Day is published, in Two Volumes, price 1*l.* 8*s.* in boards, 17th Edition, newly
Arranged, and considerably Improved, of

DEBRETTS'S PEERAGE of the United Kingdom of Great
Britain and Ireland.

London: printed for Rivingtons, Egerton, Cuthell, Clarkes, Longman and Co.,
Cadell, Richardson, Booth, Booker, Baldwin and Co., Bagster, Hatchard and Son,
Harding, Martin, Hamilton and Co., Parbury and Co., Lloyds, and Saunders and
Hodgson.

* * * For the present Edition, a new and very expensive set of Plates has been pur-
posely engraved, on a larger scale, and of much superior execution to any previously
given. A considerable delay has been occasioned by the Creation of several Peers at
the very moment it was ready for publication.

A New Edition of DEBRETTS'S BARONETAGE, will speedily be published.

This Day is published, in 8vo. price 6*s.* in boards, with a Map and Plan,
MILITARY REFLECTIONS ON TURKEY.

By BARON VON VALENTINI,
Major-General in the Prussian Service.

Extracted and Translated from the General's Treatise on the Art of War.

By A MILITARY OFFICER.

Printed for C. & J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall.

RIVINGTONS' MINIATURE EDITION of BISHOP WILSON'S
Introduction to the Holy Sacrament, with the Communion Service annexed, is
just published, with a Portrait of the Bishop by Dean. Price 2*s.* neatly bound in
black sheep; 2*s.* 6*d.* in black calf; and 4*s.* 6*d.* in morocco—and may be had of all
Booksellers.

*St. Paul's Church Yard,
and Waterloo Place, Pall-Mall.*

This Day is published, in One Volume, post 8vo. price 7s. 6d. boards,

THE FIFTH EDITION of the **MORNING** and **EVENING**
SACRIFICE; or, Prayers for Private Persons and Families.

* * This Work is divided into the Four following Parts:—1. Prayers for Private Persons, adapted to the different Days of the Week, to Sacramental Sabbaths and Days of Humiliation.—2. Family Prayers for the Sabbath-day.—3. Prayers for Persons who are in peculiar Circumstances.—4. A Copious Selection of Prayers entirely in the Language of Scripture. The Work is introduced by Two Discourses explanatory of the Lord's Prayer.

It has been the object of the Author, by combining simplicity of Language with elevation and Christian fervour of Sentiment, to render this Volume a suitable Manual of Devotion for Persons of all ranks.

Printed for Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh; and George B. Whittaker, London.

This Day is published, price 1s. 6d.

ELEMENTS of **PROPHETIC INTERPRETATION**; or, Easy
Lessons introductory to the Study of Prophecy, with a Symbolical Dictionary
founded on Scripture.

Printed for J. Hatchard and Son, 187, Piccadilly.

This Day is published, in 12mo. price 5s.

SHORT and **FAMILIAR SERMONS**, for the Use of Schools and
Young Persons in general.

By the Rev. THOMAS SCARD, B.A.

Master of Bishop's Waltham School, and Curate of Durley, Hants.

London: published by Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green; R. Galpine,
Lymington; and to be had of all Booksellers.

This Day are published, the Third Edition, 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS, preached at Glasbury, Brecknockshire.

By the Rev. C. BRADLEY,
Vicar of Glasbury.

Sold by Hamilton, Adams and Co. Paternoster Row.

By the Same.

SERMONS at **HIGH WYCOMBE**. 2 vols. Seventh Edition. 21s.

This Day is published, in 2 vols. 8vo. price 21s. boards.

SYSTEMATIC MORALITY; or, a Treatise on the **THEORY**
and **PRACTICE** of **HUMAN DUTY**, on the Grounds of Natural Religion.

By **WILLIAM JEVONS**.

Printed for R. Hunter, 72, St. Paul's Church Yard.

"We can safely recommend it as containing a valuable fund of practical good sense, which few can study with the attention it deserves without being made both wiser and better."

"We doubt whether there exists in any other work a statement of the evidence in favour of a future state, as derived from the light of nature, which can be compared with it for intrinsic force, or for elegance and beauty of illustration."—*Monthly Repository*.

*BOOKS lately printed at the CLARENDON PRESS, for the
UNIVERSITY of OXFORD,*

Sold by J. PARKER, Oxford; and by Messrs. PAYNE and Foss, Pall Mall, London,
At the following Prices in Sheets:

BULL'S WORKS, Collected and Revised by the Rev. E. BURTON,
with NELSON'S LIFE. 7 vols. 8vo. 1827. 3*l.* 8*s.*

BURTON'S TESTIMONIES of the ANTI-NICENE FATHERS
to the DIVINITY of CHRIST. 1826. 8vo. 10*s.*

CHANDLER'S TRAVELS in GREECE and ASIA MINOR,
with Plates. 2 vols. 8vo. 1825. 17*s.*

CLARENDON'S HISTORY of the REBELLION, with the Sup-
pressed Passages, and Notes by WARBURTON, &c. 8 vols. 8vo. 1826. 3*l.* 6*s.* ;
large paper, 10*l.*

CLARENDON'S LIFE, and CONTINUATION, with the Sup-
pressed Passages. 3 vols. 8vo. Large paper, 4*l.* ; small paper, 1*l.* 10*s.*

The CLERGYMAN'S INSTRUCTOR ; or, a Collection of Tracts
on the Ministerial Duties. 8vo. 1827. 6*s.* 6*d.*

CLINTON'S FASTI HELLENICI. The Civil and Literary
Chronology of Greece, from the LVth to the CXXIVth Olympiad. Second Edition,
with Additions. 1827. 4to. 1*l.* 8*s.* 6*d.*

COTTON'S TYPOGRAPHICAL GAZETTEER. 1825. 8vo. 8*s.*

CRAMER'S GEOGRAPHICAL and HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION
of ANTIENT ITALY, with a Map of Italy, and Plan of Rome. 2 vols. 8vo.
1826. 1*l.* 10*s.*

————— 2 vols. 8vo. without the Map, 1*l.*

————— Map on two sheets, 15*s.*

FORMULARIES of FAITH set forth by the King's Authority
during the Reign of Henry VIII. 1825. 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

SCOTT'S CHRISTIAN LIFE and WORKS. 6 vols. 8vo. 1826.
2*l.* 5*s.*

HOMERI ODYSSEA cum Scholiis Veteribus. Accedunt Batra-
chomyomachia, Hymni, Fragmenta. 2 vols. 8vo. 1827. 15*s.* ; large paper, 2*l.*

NOVUM TESTAMENTUM. Accedunt Parallela S. Scripturæ
Loca necnon Vetera Evangeliorum et Epistolarum Capitula et Canones Eusebii. 12mo.
1827. 7*s.* 6*d.*

SYLLOGE CONFESSIONUM sub tempus Reformandæ Ecclesiæ
editarum ; videlicet, Professio Fidei Tridentina, Confessio Helvetica, Augustana, Sax-
onica, Belgica. Subjiciuntur Catechismus Heidelbergensis et Canones Synodi Dor-
drechtanæ. 8vo. 1827. 7*s.* 6*d.*

In the Press.

Horbery's Works.

Burnet's History of the Reformation. Demy 8vo.

Index Græcitis Oratorum, Atticorum.

The Works of Sir Walter Raleigh, together with his Life.

Cramer's Geographical and Historical Description of Greece.

NEW WEEK'S PREPARATION,

With Considerable Improvements, by the REV. SAMUEL WIX.

This Day is published, in Two Parts, each 2s. 6d. neatly bound in black ;
or complete, 5s. neatly bound in calf,

THE NEW WEEK'S PREPARATION for a WORTHY RECEIVING of the LORD'S SUPPER, as recommended and appointed by the Church of England ; and a Companion at the Altar, directing the Communicant in his Behaviour and Devotions at the Lord's Table ; with Instructions how to live well after receiving the Holy Sacrament.

Revised by SAMUEL WIX, A.M. F.R. and A.S.
Vicar of St. Bartholomew-the-Less, London.

Printed for C. & J. Rivington ; Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown and Green ; H. T. Hodgson ; J. Richardson ; J. M. Richardson ; Hatchard and Son ; Hurst, Chance and Co. ; J. Duncan ; Sherwood and Co. ; G. B. Whittaker ; and Simpkin and Marshall.

Handsomely printed in small 8vo. with Ten Plates, price 7s. 6d.,

A NEW EDITION OF

A NEW SYSTEM of DOMESTIC COOKERY, formed upon Principles of Economy, and adapted for the Use of Private Families. Comprising also the Art of Carving ; Observations on the Management of the Dairy and Poultry Yard ; Instructions for Home Brewery, Wines, &c. ; Cookery for the Sick, and for the Poor ; many very useful Miscellaneous Receipts and Directions proper to be given to Servants, both in Town and Country. To which is prefixed, an Essay on Domestic Economy and Household Management, comprising many Observations which will be found particularly useful to the Mistress of a Family.

By A LADY.

"This is really one of the most practically useful books of any which we have seen on the subject. The Lady, who has written it, has not studied how to form expensive articles for luxurious tables, but to combine elegance with economy ; she has given her directions in a plain sensible manner, that every body can understand, and these are not confined merely to cookery, but are extended to a variety of objects in use in families ; by which means the utility of the book is very much increased indeed."—*British Critic.*

Printed for JOHN MURRAY, Albemarle Street ;

Sold also by every Bookseller and Newsman, in England, Scotland and Ireland.

New Edition.

FAMILY RECEIPT BOOK. Small 8vo. 7s. 6d.

In a neat Pocket Volume, price 2s. bound, (or, in a superior manner, 2s. 6d. ;
in black calf, 3s. ; in morocco, 6s.)

PREPARATION for the LORD'S SUPPER, with a Companion to the Altar ; intended chiefly for the Use of the Female Sex.

By Mrs. CORNWALLIS.

London: printed for Baldwin and Cradock ; by whom also are published,

By the same Author,

OBSERVATIONS on the CANONICAL SCRIPTURES. Second Edition. 4 vols. 8vo. 2l. 2s.

STURM'S MORNING MEDITATIONS.

Handsomely printed in 2 vols. price 16s. boards, the Second Edition, thoroughly Revised and Corrected, of

MORNING COMMUNINGS with GOD; or, Devotional Meditations for every Day of the Year. Translated from the original German of Christian Christopher Sturm, Author of "Reflections," &c.

By WILLIAM JOHNSTONE, A.M.

This is the first translation into English that has ever been made of these Devotional Meditations of Sturm, which are every way worthy of the Author of the Reflections.

London: printed for Baldwin and Cradock, of whom may be had,

Recently published,

CONTEMPLATIONS on the SUFFERINGS of JESUS CHRIST, in a Series of Devotional Exercises, with an Explanatory Paraphrase of the Gospel Narrative. By the Same. Printed uniform with the preceding, with a Memoir and a Portrait of Sturm. Price 9s. boards.

This Day is Published, in Royal 8vo. Price 2s.

PHILOSOPHY unlightened by DIVINE TRUTH a Vain Deceit; a Sermon preached in the Church of Ashford, Kent, on Monday, August 20, 1827, at the Visitation of his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

By the Rev. Dr. HOLLAND,
Precentor of Chichester.

Printed for C. and J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall.

Also by the same Author,

The Sixth Edition of the PREACHING of the REGULAR CLERGY, Illustrated and Defended, in a Visitation Sermon. Royal 8vo. 9s.

The CHURCH; a Consecration Sermon, preached in Lambeth Chapel at the Consecration of the Lord Bishop of Chichester. 4to.

A SERMON preached at the Opening of the Chapel of Partis's College; with some Account of the Institution. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

This Day is published, in 2 vols. 8vo. price 1l. 5s. boards, the Third Edition of

CLAVIS CALENDARIA; or, a compendious Analysis of the Calendar, illustrated with Ecclesiastical, Historical, and Classical Anecdotes.

By JOHN BRADY.

Printed for Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown and Green,

Of whom may be had,

CLAVIS CALENDARIA; abridged by the Author, and illustrated with the Ecclesiastical, Historical and Classical Anecdotes contained in the larger work, in 12mo. 7s. 6d. boards.

This Day is published, Vol. I. 8vo. price 15s.

THE HISTORY OF ROME, by B. G. NIEBUHR, Translated by JULIUS C. HARE, M.A., and CONNOP THIRLWALL, M.A. Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge.

"The work which I here lay before the public is, as the first glance will show, an entirely new one, in which scarcely a few fragments of the former have been incorporated."—*Author's Preface.*

Cambridge: printed by John Smith, Printer to the University, for John Taylor, Waterloo Place, Pall Mall, Bookseller and Publisher to the University of London, and sold by James Duncan, Paternoster Row.

This Day is published, in 8vo. price 1s. 6d.

A LETTER to the Editor of the QUARTERLY REVIEW, in Furtherance of the Subjects of Three Articles in No. LXXII. of that Review, entitled, "On Agriculture and Rent:"—"On Substitution of Savings' Banks for Poor Laws:"—"On Planting Waste Lands."

By the Rev. F. MEREWETHER,
Vicar of Whitwick, Leicestershire.

Printed for C. and J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall; and Combe and Son, Leicester.

This Day is published, price 4d. or 3s. per Dozen.

WHY THE POOR SHOULD GO TO CHURCH; a Tract for distribution among the Poor; in which the Excuses commonly made by them for not going to Church are severally considered; and the Necessity for their going to Church set plainly before them.

By the Rev. C. J. HEATHCOTE, M.A.

Printed for C. and J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall; and W. Jackson, Hackney.

Lately published, in Two Volumes, demy 8vo, price 1l. 1s. extra boards,
A TOUR in FRANCE, SAVOY, NORTHERN ITALY, SWITZERLAND, GERMANY, and the NETHERLANDS, in the Summer of 1825, including some Observations on the Scenery of the Neckar and the Rhine.

By SETH WILLIAM STEVENSON,
of Norwich.

"We can bear witness to the Author's research; to his powers of description; and to the unpretending tone and singleness of purpose, which are not the least recommendations of his book—a work which contains much that is entertaining and interesting. Mr. Stevenson's notices of scenery are striking, because simple and accurate; and his topography is remarkably correct."—*Monthly Review*.

"The whole of the Author's journey is performed in the space of twelve weeks; but the beauties of the spots visited, and the pleasant easy manner in which they are painted, render this work amusing; and it will be consulted with profit and pleasure by those who may have occasion to take a similar run, or even by those who, debarred from so much satisfaction, must rest contented with the mere description of charms they cannot enjoy.—We leave the Tour, as one interesting in itself and likely to be very useful to future travellers, to the patronage it well merits."—*Literary Gazette*.

"These volumes are very entertaining and instructive, and we can safely recommend the perusal of them to our readers."—*Gentleman's Magazine*.

"Acceptable as these volumes are for the pleasing and useful nature of their general contents, the Author merits acknowledgement, as a Protestant and an Englishman, for his remarks relative to the present state of Roman Catholicism and of the Reformed Religion on the Continent."—*Courier*.

"This work, which displays taste, judgment, and good feeling, is, for its fidelity and intelligence, well worthy the perusal of travellers taking the same route, its use as a guide being very considerable."—*Vide La Belle Assemblée, Repository of Arts, Wesleyan Magazine, Sphinx, &c. &c. &c.*

London: Published by C. and J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall; Matchett, Stevenson, and Matchett, Norwich; J. and J. J. Deighton, Cambridge; J. Parker, Oxford; Todds and Marsh, York; Norton, Bristol; C. Hough, Gloucester; and Bell and Bradfute, Edinburgh.

BOOKS FOR YOUNG PERSONS.

*Published by C. and J. RIVINGTON, St. Paul's Church-Yard,
and Waterloo-Place, London.*

BINGLEY'S (Rev. W.) **BIOGRAPHICAL CONVERSATIONS** on **CELEBRATED TRAVELLERS**; comprehending distinct Narratives of their personal Adventures. Third Edition. 12mo. price 7s. in boards.

BIOGRAPHICAL CONVERSATIONS on the most **EMINENT VOYAGERS** of different Nations; from Columbus to Cook. Third Edition. 12mo. 7s. in boards.

ANSON'S (Lord) **VOYAGE ROUND the WORLD** in 1740, 1741, 1742, 1743, and 1744. With a Map. 12mo. 5s. 6d.

JONES'S (Rev. W.) **Letters from a Tutor to his Pupils**, upon Literary and Moral Subjects. 12mo. 3s. in boards.

ONE HUNDRED FABLES in Verse, by various Authors. Selected and Revised by the Rev. J. PLUMPTRE, B.D. Vicar of Great Gransden. 12mo. 5s. in boards.

FABLES in Verse, for the **FEMALE SEX**. By **EDWARD MOORE**, **HENRY BROOKE**, and others. Selected and revised by the Rev. J. PLUMPTRE. 12mo. 4s. in boards.

ROBINSON CRUSOE, Life and Adventures of. A New Edition, **DIVIDED INTO CHAPTERS**, and revised by the Rev. J. PLUMPTRE. In One Volume, printed in large type. With Eight Wood Cuts. 12mo. 7s. in boards.

The **LIFE** of **JOHN, DUKE of MARLBOROUGH**. Abridged from the Quarterly Review, with Consent of the Proprietor. 12mo. 2s. half-bound.

The **CAMPAIGNS** of **ARTHUR, DUKE of WELLINGTON**, Abridged from the same. 12mo. 2s. 6d. half-bound.

The **LIFE** of **HORATIO, LORD VISCOUNT NELSON**. Abridged from Southey, with Consent of the Proprietor. 12mo. 3s. half-bound.

NARRATIVES of **SHIPWRECKS**. Loss of the **LADY HOBART** Packet; of the Hon. E. Ind. Co.'s Ship **CABALVA**; and of the **CENTAUR** and **LITCHFIELD** Men-of-War. 12mo. 2s. sewed.

MAUNDRELL'S (Rev. H.) **Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem**, in 1607. 12mo. 2s. 6d. boards.

MEMOIRS of **WILLIAM STEVENS**, Esq. By the Hon. Sir **JAMES ALLAN PARK**. 12mo. 2s. 6d. boards.

STURM'S REFLECTIONS for every Day in the Year. Abridged by J. HEMET. 1 vol. 12mo. 5s. bound.

PATRIARCHAL TIMES, or the Land of Canaan. In Seven Books, Founded on the Holy Scriptures. By Miss O'KEEFE. New Edition, in one volume 12mo. 7s. in boards.

FEMALE SCRIPTURE CHARACTERS; exemplifying Female Virtues. By Mrs. KING. Tenth Edition; with a Portrait. 12mo. 6s. in boards.

JOSEPHUS'S WARS of the **JEWS**; or the History of the Destruction of Jerusalem. In two Volumes. 12mo. 8s. in boards.

WALTON'S (ISAAC) Lives of **Dr. DONNE**, **Sir H. WOTTON**, **RICHARD HOOKER**, **Geo. HERBERT**, and **Dr. R. SANDERSON**. 12mo. 5s. 6d. boards.

REV. T. SCOTT'S BIBLE.—NEW EDITION WITH MAPS.

This Day is Published, with the addition of Ten finely engraved Maps,—A New Edition, in Six Volumes, 4to. Price Eight Guineas boards, of

THE HOLY BIBLE, with the Notes, Practical Observations, and copious Marginal References of the

REV. THOMAS SCOTT,
late Rector of Aston Sandford.

“It is difficult to form a just estimate of a work on which such an author laboured for thirty-three years. It entitles him of itself to rank at the head of the theologians of his own time, as at once the most laborious and important writer of the day. The capital excellency of this valuable and immense undertaking perhaps consists in the following, more closely than any other, the fair and adequate meaning of every part of Scripture, without regard to the niceties of human systems: it is in every sense of the expression a scriptural comment.—It is not a compilation, it is an original production, in which you have the deliberate judgment of a masculine and independent mind on all the parts of Holy Scripture. Every Student will understand the value of such a work.—Further, it is *the Comment of our age*; presenting many of the last lights which history casts on the interpretation of prophecy, giving several of the remarks which sound criticism has accumulated from the different branches of Sacred Literature, obviating the chief objections which modern annotators have advanced against some of the distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel, and adapting the instructions of Scripture to the peculiar circumstances of the times in which we live.”

Rev. D. Wilson's Sermon on the Death of Mr. Scott.

Printed for L. B. Sceley and Sons, Hatchard and Son, and Baldwin, Cradock, and Joy, London.

NEW MUSIC.

This Day is published, price 2s.

DEDICATED (BY PERMISSION) TO HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

“FROM GREENLAND'S ICY MOUNTAINS;”
A HYMN, written by

The Right Rev. REGINALD HEBER, D.D.

Late Bishop of Calcutta, and intended to be sung before a Collection made for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, composed

By ESTHER ELIZABETH FLEET,
Organist of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate.

Printed by Monro and May, 11 Holborn Bars, and sold by C. and J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall.

TO TRAVELLERS IN ITALY AND THE LEVANT,

Where the Italian and Greek Languages are spoken.

This Day is published, price 5s.

THE MODERN GREEK INTERPRETER, in familiar Dialogues in Modern Greek, English and Italian.

By Mess^{rs}. M. E. & T. MACRI, of Athens.

Sold by J. Souter, 73, St. Paul's Church Yard, London.

This Day is published, in 8vo. price 2s.

CONSIDERATIONS on the **INEXPEDIENCY** of the **REPEAL** of the **CORPORATION** and **TEST ACTS**. To which are appended, Remarks on the Reformation, and on the Restoration of the Church and Monarchy after the Overthrow of both by the Dissenters: explanatory of the Constitution of the Church, and the Unjustifiableness of Separation from it.

By the Rev. **STEPHEN HYDE CASSAN, M.A.**

Printed for C. & J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall.

In Two Parts, 8vo. price 20s. boards,

CALVINISM and **ARMINIANISM COMPARED** in their Principles and Tendency: or, the Doctrines of General Redemption, as held by the Members of the Church of England, and by the early Dutch Arminians, exhibited in their Scriptural Evidence, and in their connection with the Civil and Religious Liberties of Mankind.

By **JAMES NICHOLS.**

London: published by Longman, Rees, Orme and Co.; and by C. & J. Rivington.

"The book ought to have a place in every historical, and in every ecclesiastical library. Mr. Nichols has also published the first volume of a translation of the *Works of Arminius*, with a great deal of important matter in the Prolegomena and Notes.—It has been well observed by a most diligent and meritorious author, (Mr. James Nichols, in his *Calvinism and Arminianism Compared*,) intimately conversant with the history of that age, and better acquainted than any other person with what were then the bearings and effects of religious opinions upon political affairs, that the constitution, even at its deepest depression in Charles's days, contained within itself copious materials for self-restoration."—*Quarterly Review*.

"*Calvinism and Arminianism Compared*, is from the pen of a Layman, a man of extensive and accurate reading upon all subjects connected with the history of Protestantism, and especially with the painful annals of Presbyterian and Independent Ascendancy in this country. None will deny Mr. Nichols the praise of laborious research, of great acuteness in seizing on points needful for the elucidation of his own opinions, and singular devotedness of mind to inquiries, which secular cares generally leave to the leisure of professed divines."—*British Critic and Quarterly Theological Rev.*

In the Press.

The Second Volume of **THE WORKS OF ARMINIUS** will be ready for delivery to the Subscribers early in May.

This Day is published, in 12mo. price 7s. boards,

THE CRUSADE of FIDELIS; a Knight of the Order of the Cross; being the History of his Adventures, during his Pilgrimage to the Celestial City.

"Which things are an Allegory."

London: sold by Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown and Green; and Henry Moseley and Son, Derby.

This Day is published, in One Volume, 8vo.

A BRIEF INQUIRY into the **PROSPECTS** of the **CHRISTIAN CHURCH** in Connection with the Second Advent of our Lord Jesus Christ.

By the Hon. and Rev. **GERARD NOEL**,
Curate of Richmond, Surrey.

Printed for J. Hatchard and Son, 187, Piccadilly.

For the CLERGY, FAMILIES, &c.

Just published, in One thick Volume, the Third Edition, much Enlarged and Improved,
Price 15s.

1. MODERN DOMESTIC MEDICINE; or, a Popular Treatise, exhibiting the Nature, Symptoms, Causes, and correct Treatment of all Diseases, embracing all the modern Improvements, with the Opinions of the most distinguished Physicians. Containing, also, a Domestic Materia Medica; a copious Collection of approved Prescriptions; Medical Management of Children; Rules of Diet; Treatment of all Casualties; Table of the Doses of Medicines, &c. &c. The whole forming a comprehensive Medical Guide for Clergymen, Families, and Invalids.

By T. J. GRAHAM, M.D. &c.

"We conscientiously recommend Dr. Graham's Treatise to the Public, and feel great pleasure in the certainty that it will prove extensively useful. It is certainly very far above the celebrated Buchan's."—*Literary Chronicle*, Oct.

"In the opinion of a respectable Physician, well known in our connexion, it is enriched with much of all that modern practice has ascertained to be valuable, and is not only incomparably superior to Buchan's, but also to every similar work in our language."—*Wesleyan Magazine*, Jan.

"It will be found a very valuable acquisition to the family library, and no medicine chest, at home or abroad, ought to be considered complete without it."—*Imperial Magazine*, April.

"To families in general, travellers, and missionaries, we most earnestly recommend this admirable compendium of domestic medicine. It has a decisive superiority over all other works of similar pretensions."—*Testimony of a Physician in Evangelical Magazine*, May.

ALSO, BY THE SAME AUTHOR,

2. A TREATISE on INDIGESTION and LIVER COMPLAINTS; illustrating the real Nature and correct Treatment of these very prevailing Disorders. Price 7s.

"We sincerely recommend it, and have long been convinced that such a work was imperatively called for."—*London Medical Journal*.

Published by Hatchards, Piccadilly, London: sold by Deighton, Cambridge;
Slatter, Oxford, and all Booksellers.

This Day is published, the Fourth Edition, with an Annual Graduation of the Tables,
price 2s. 6d.

THE CONSTITUTION of FRIENDLY SOCIETIES, upon Legal and Scientific Principles, exemplified by the Rules and Tables adopted for the government of the Southwell Friendly Institution; examined, authenticated, and recommended for general use, by W. MORGAN, Esq. F.R.S. and A. MORGAN, Esq. Joint Actuaries of the Equitable Assurance Society.

By the Rev. J. T. BECHER, M.A.

Prebendary of the Collegiate Church of Southwell; Chairman of the Quarter Sessions for the Newark Division of the County of Nottingham, and for the Liberty of Southwell and Scrooby.

London: printed for W. Simpkin and R. Marshall, Stationers' Hall Court, Ludgate Street.

In the Press, by the same Author,

The ANTI-PAUPER SYSTEM; exemplifying the positive and practical good realized by the Relievers and the Relieved, under the frugal, beneficent, and lawful Administration of the Poor Laws prevailing at Southwell and in the Neighbouring District: with Plans of the Southwell Workhouse, and of the Thurgarton Hundred Workhouse.

REPORTS ON PUBLIC CHARITIES.

In 8vo. boards, price 12s. Vol. I. of an

ACCOUNT of PUBLIC CHARITIES in ENGLAND and WALES; comprising the Charities of Seventeen of the chartered Companies of London and of the principal Cities and Towns; including Bristol, Bath, York, Manchester, Lancaster, Blackburn, Oldham, Leeds, Ripon, Knaresborough, Beverley, Selby, Stafford, Wolverhampton, Northampton, Gloucester, Stratford, Lichfield, Bedford, Croydon, St. Bees, Yeovil, &c.; digested from the Reports of the Commissioners on Charitable Foundations. With Notes and Comments,

BY THE EDITOR OF "THE CABINET LAWYER."

"This work is unquestionably of great importance, and we can, with great confidence, recommend it to our readers. The notes and comments, by the Editor, are elucidatory and satisfactory; and he has executed his difficult task with much tact and ability."—*The Star*, March 5, 1827.

"The important and curious particulars respecting each charity are brought under one head, unincumbered with trifling and tedious details. Notes and comments, written in a bold but at the same time moderate spirit, are added; but they are very properly kept distant from the narrative part, which is made up exclusively of facts. We are much mistaken, or this instructive and amusing compilation will not only stimulate the public generally to renewed and reiterated demands for a better administration of the charities so abundantly scattered throughout the country, but will excite in the places most interested zealous efforts to reform their abuses and extend their benefits."—*Examiner*, January 28, 1827.

"The Compiler has added some very curious and pertinent notes."—*Times*, December 29, 1826.

"We consider the 'Public Charities' as a work of great national importance."—*British Traveller*, April 4, 1827.

"Although we have more than once recommended this useful, clever work, and several journals have echoed our sentiments, we still esteem it beyond the praise it has elicited."—*The Literary Chronicle*, June 9.

II.

THIRD EDITION, WITH THE NEW ACTS,

In a closely printed Volume, 18mo. 7s. 6d. boards,

THE CABINET LAWYER; or, a Popular Digest of the Laws of England; with a DICTIONARY of Law Terms, Maxims, Acts of Parliament, and Judicial Antiquities, correct Tables of Assessed Taxes, Stamp Duties, Excise Licenses, and Post-Horse Duties; Post-Office Regulations, Rates of Portage, Turnpike Laws, Corn Laws, Prison Regulations, &c. &c.—In this edition, the Acts of last Session have been carefully digested and incorporated into the Work; including all the alterations in the Criminal Laws—the Game Laws—Corn Laws—Stamp, Malt, and Excise Duties—Bills of Exchange—Sale of Church Preferment—Arrest of Debtors—Parliamentary Elections—Malicious Mischief—Spring-Guns—Remedies against the Hundred—Church-Building Acts—Landlords and Tenants—Post-Office Rates—Turnpike Roads—Constables—Carriers—Factors, &c. The Decisions in the Courts of Law from the publication of the Second Edition have been included, and the whole brought down to the end of the last Summer Assizes.

"This very useful book, carefully revised and much improved, has worthily reached a third edition. It is an excellent digest, and does great credit to the Editor."—*Literary Gazette*, October 20, 1827.

"The only book pretending to a popular view of the subject is Blackstone's; and the numerous changes that have been brought about within the last fifty years have rendered it almost useless; and, in many instances, worse—misleading. But this work is a vigorous and unincumbered statement of the subject—a competent digest, com-

pressed to a tangible size, without confusion or obscurity. There is no nonsense in the book—none of the idle reasons for things of which Blackstone is full. The second edition has considerable improvements.”—*Monthly Magazine*, May 1, 1827.

“The work is compiled with industry, the information very copious, and condensed with great care—not slavishly copying the order of Acts of Parliament, but giving the substance and spirit of existing laws in a pains-taking and well-expressed summary. The late important alterations in the laws relating to bankrupts, merchant and factor, juries, &c. are all embodied in this epitome, which, as a book of reference, possesses the great merit of clear arrangement and good tables of contents.”—*Examiner*.

“A most valuable book: necessary to many individuals, and useful to all.”—*Literary Chronicle*.

Printed for W. Simpkin and R. Marshall, Stationers’ Hall Court, Ludgate Street.

This Day is published, dedicated (by Permission) to the RIGHT HON. ROBERT PEEL, in Two Vols. 4to. with a Portrait by Finden, price 3l. 12s. in boards.

A HISTORY of the RIGHT HON. WILLIAM PITT, EARL of CHATHAM; containing his Speeches in Parliament, a considerable Portion of his Correspondence when Secretary of State, upon French, Spanish, and American Affairs, never before published; with an Account of the Principal Events and Persons connected with his Life, Sentiments, and Administrations.

By the Rev. FRANCIS THACKERAY, A.M.

London: Printed for C. and J. Rivington, Booksellers Extraordinary to His Majesty, Waterloo Place, Pall Mall, and St. Paul’s Church Yard.

A NEW HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

This Day is published, No. VII. price 6d. to be continued Monthly, of

A HISTORY of ENGLAND, from the Earliest Periods to the Present Time; in which it is intended to consider Men and Events on Christian Principles.

By a CLERGYMAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

This Work has been undertaken from the wish that our National History might be taught without connecting with it a constant call to worldly-mindedness.

The Author does not propose to write for the professed Political Scholar; but offers the result of his studies for the benefit of those who are contented to aim at less ambitious attainments.

He will, therefore, endeavour to make whatever he has occasion to speak of intelligible to persons of limited information; and to keep down the size of his work to about the scale of Goldsmith’s History. At the same time, as the sanguinary details of war are, in his view, the least important of the subjects on which he has to treat, the brevity of his notices of them will leave a larger space for recording and examining the progress and decline of Religion, the formation of our excellent Constitution, the state of Public Morals and Literature, and the advance and diffusion of the Useful Arts.

The Work is printed in Duodecimo, on a good Paper, each Number will contain forty-eight pages of letter-press, and it is presumed that it will be comprised in about forty-eight Numbers.

Published by C. and J. Rivington, St. Paul’s Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall, and sold by all other Booksellers.

* * * The Preface, explaining the Plan of the Work and the motives which induced the undertaking, may be had *gratis*.

This Day is published, price 3s. 6d. sewed,

REMARKS upon the **REPLY** of J. K. L. to the **CHARGE** of his Grace the **ARCHBISHOP** of **DUBLIN**.

By **CHARLES R. ELRINGTON, D.D.**
Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin.

Dublin : printed for Richard Milliken and Son, Grafton Street; and John Cochran, 108, Strand, London.

This Day is published, 8vo. price 3s. sewed,

REPLY to an **INQUIRY** by the Rev. S. R. **MAITLAND**, Perpetual Curate of Christ Church, Gloucester, into the Grounds on which the Prophetic Period of Daniel and St. John has been supposed to consist of 1260 Years.

By a **MEMBER** of the **CHURCH** of **ENGLAND**.

Printed for J. Hatchard and Son, 187, Piccadilly; and sold by Hough and Few, Gloucester.

This Day is published, in 8vo. price 10s. 6d. boards.

SERMONS, partly illustrative of the Devotional Services of the Church of England.

By the Rev. **THOMAS SIMS, M.A.**
Domestic Chaplain to her Grace the Duchess Dowager of Beaufort.

Printed for C. and J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall.

Of whom may be had,

An **HISTORICAL DEFENCE** of the **WALDENSES**, or **Vaudois** Inhabitants of the Valleys of Piedmont, by **JEAN RODOLPHE PEYRAN**, late Pastor of Pomaret, and Moderator of the Waldensian Church. With an Introduction and Appendixes. By the Rev. **THOMAS SIMS**. In 8vo. price 15s. boards.

This Day is published, in One Volume, 8vo. with Ten Views of Scenery, Two Maps, and Three Fac-similes, price 18s. in boards, dedicated (by Permission) to His **MAJESTY**, the Fourth Edition of

NARRATIVE of an **EXCURSION** to the **MOUNTAINS** of **PIEMONTE** in 1823, and **RESEARCHES** among the **VAUDOIS**, or **WALDENSES**, Protestant Inhabitants of the Cottian Alps: with the **APPENDIX**, containing Copies of Ancient Manuscripts, and other interesting Documents, in Illustration of the History and Manners of that extraordinary People.

By the Rev. **WILLIAM STEPHEN GILLY, M.A. M.R.S.L.**
Prebendary of Durham, and Rector of North Fambridge, Essex.

London: Printed for C. and J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall.

* * * The Ten Views may be had separately, price 6s.

This Day, post 8vo. 6s.

CONSIDERATIONS on **MIRACLES**.

By the Rev. **CHARLES WEBB LE BAS, M.A.**
Rector of St. Paul, Shadwell, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Printed for John Murray, Albemarle Street.

REV. E. BERENS' WORKS.

*Published by C. and J. RIVINGTON, Waterloo Place, Pall Mall,
and St. Paul's Church Yard.*

LENT LECTURES on the Church Catechism, the Offices of the Church, and the Penitential Psalms. 12mo. 5s. boards.

These may be had separately, viz.

1. Six Lectures on the Church Catechism. 1s. 6d. stitched; 1s. 9d. in boards.
2. Eight Lectures on the Offices of the Church of England. 2s. stitched; 2s. 3d. in boards.
3. Six Lectures on the Penitential Psalms. 1s. 6d. stitched; 1s. 9d. boards.

II.

THIRTY-THREE VILLAGE SERMONS, on the chief Articles of Faith, &c. on the Christian Character, and on some of the Relative Duties. In one volume, 12mo. price 4s. 6d. boards.

They are sold separately as follows:

1. Eleven Sermons on the chief Articles of Faith, and on the Means of Grace. 2s. 3d. stitched; or 2s. 6d. in boards.
2. Sixteen Sermons on some Parts of the Christian Character. 3s. sewed; or 3s. 3d. in boards.
3. Six Sermons on some of the Relative Duties. 1s. 6d. stitched; or 1s. 9d. in bds.

III.

SERMONS on SICKNESS, SORROW, and DEATH. 12mo. 3s.

IV.

SERMONS for YOUNG PERSONS in the Higher and Middle Classes of Society. Selected from Ninety-two Sermons, by the late Right Rev. THEODORE DEHON, D.D. Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of South Carolina. In 12mo. price 5s. boards.

V.

A SELECTION from the PAPERS of ADDISON, in the SPECTATOR and GUARDIAN; for the Use of Young Persons. In one volume, 12mo. price 4s. 6d. in boards.

VI.

A SECOND SELECTION from the PAPERS of ADDISON in the Spectator. 12mo. 5s. 6d.

The present Selection is intended for readers whose literary education has been more advanced, and who have more leisure for light reading, than many of those for whom the former Volume was designed.

VII.

LECTURES on the LITURGY, arranged and slightly abridged from the Commentary of P. Waldo, Esq. 12mo. 4s.

This Day are published, 8vo. price 9s. boards,

SERMONS, by the Rev. J. G. FOYSTER, A.M. Minister of Trinity Chapel, Knightsbridge.

Printed for J. Hatchard and Son, 187, Piccadilly; and sold by C. & J. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard and Waterloo Place.

This Day, 8vo. 2s. 6d.

THE MARRIAGE IN CANA; a Poem.

By the Rev. EDWARD SMEDLEY, A.M.

Printed for John Murray, Albemarle Street.

Of whom may be had, LUX RENATA; a Protestant Epistle. 3s.

JENKS'S DEVOTION IMPROVED BY SIMEON.

This Day is published, in 12mo. price 4s. 6d. bound, the Thirty-second Edition of

PRAYERS and OFFICES of DEVOTION for FAMILIES, and for particular Persons upon most Occasions.

By BENJAMIN JENKS,

Late Rector of Harley, in Shropshire, and Chaplain to the Right Hon. the Earl of Bradford.

Altered and improved by the Rev. CHARLES SIMEON, Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.

Printed for C. and J. Rivington; Longman and Co.; J. Richardson; R. Scholey; Baldwin and Co.; Hamilton and Co.; J. Duncan; Black and Co.; G. B. Whittaker; Simpkin and Marshall; and J. Nisbet.

This Day is published, handsomely printed in 6 vols. 8vo. with a Portrait, price 3l. 18s. in boards, the Third Edition of

THE POETICAL WORKS of JOHN MILTON. With Notes of Various Authors, and other Illustrations; together with some Account of the Life and Writings of Milton, derived principally from Documents in His Majesty's State-Paper Office, now first published.

By the Rev. H. J. TODD, M.A. F.S.A. and R.S.L.

Chaplain in Ordinary to his Majesty,
and Rector of Settrington, County of York.

London: Printed for C. and J. Rivington; J. Cuthell; J. Nunn; J. and W. T. Clarke; Longman and Co.; T. Cadell; Jeffery and Son; J. Richardson; J. and A. Arch; Carpenter and Son; Baldwin and Co.; J. Booker; J. Bonn; J. Duncan; Black and Co.; G. B. Whittaker; J. Bain; W. Mason; J. Hearne; Simpkin and Marshall; and Saunders and Hodgson.

* * The Life may be purchased separately, in one vol. 8vo. price 10s. 6d. in boards.

Just Published, Price 5s. 6d.

THE CHURCH'S EXPECTATION; a Sermon on the SECOND ADVENT of our Lord Jesus Christ.

By EDWARD THOMAS VAUGHAN, M.A.

Vicar of St. Martin's, Leicester.

Also, by the same Author, Price 2s. 6d.

A LETTER to THOMAS BURBIDGE, Esq. Town Clerk of Leicester, on the DIVINE ORIGIN, NATURE and END of CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

Sold by Baldwin and Cradock, Paternoster Row.

Lately published in Two Vols. 12mo. price 16s. in boards.

HORTUS ANGLICUS; or, the Modern English Garden; containing a Familiar Description of all the Plants which are cultivated in the Climate of Great Britain, either for Use or Ornament, and of a Selection from the established Favourites of the Stove and Greenhouse; arranged according to the System of Linnæus; with Remarks on the Properties of the more valuable Species.

"To the admirers of a garden this work will form an acceptable present, as containing much variety of useful information; and it is particularly adapted to the Botanical Student, who, having pursued the research of English Plants, with Smith or Withering for his guide, is become desirous of extending his enquiries.

"This work is calculated to diffuse a knowledge of ornamental Gardening and a taste for Botanical Studies, which, indeed, are now justly considered to form an essential part of an accomplished and scientific education. It is also an easy, intelligible, and compendious guide to an acquaintance with our native plants. The descriptions are clear, and the remarks on the different genera useful and interesting. Along with an account of each species, the time of flowering, the native country, and the date of its introduction into this kingdom, are stated.—*Monthly Censor*, December, 1822.

"The Hortus Anglicus is chiefly founded on the list of plants cultivated in the Royal Botanical Garden at Kew. The general characters are extracted from Willdenow's Species Plantarum, and the place of each genus is inserted, both according to Linnæus and Jussieu. Many other works of acknowledged merit have been used to supply the remaining parts of this useful compilation, and the whole work is put together very clearly and methodically."—*British Critic*, Nov. 1822.

Also by the same Author,

THE BRITISH BOTANIST; or, a Familiar Introduction to the Science of Botany, explaining the Physiology of Vegetation, and the Principles both of the artificial and natural Systems of Linnæus, and also the Arrangement of Jussieu; to which is added, a Synopsis, or View of the British Genera; in which the Derivation and Meaning of the Name of each Genus are given, the whole intended chiefly for the Use of Young Persons. With 15 Plates. 12mo. 7s. 6d.; or with the Plates coloured, 10s. 6d.

"This work is one of the most simple and unpretending introductory manuals which has ever chanced to fall in our way. Besides an explanation of the classes and orders of Linnæus, which, after all, must be considered only as a dry Dictionary of Names, much information is also given as to the nature, uses, and cultivation of different Plants. Annexed to these also is a brief Analysis of the System of Jussieu, which, on the Continent, has already been able, in a great measure, to supersede the arrangement of his great Botanical Predecessor. The whole is conveyed in plain terms, which, in a book of science, we hold to be the greatest of all possible recommendations."—*British Critic*, Nov. 1822.

"In this Treatise we have one of the most unexceptionable preliminary guides that has fallen within the range of our cognizance; for it is perspicuous without prolixity, correct without pedantic formality; and comprehensive without intricacy or irrelevant digression. Altogether, therefore, this publication promises to conduct the young Ladies and Gentlemen of our island into the Temple of Flora, without a greater expenditure of trouble or effort than they often bestow on the most frivolous amusements."—*Monthly Review*, Dec. 1821.

Printed for C. and J. Rivington, Waterloo Place, and St. Paul's Church Yard.

C. & J. RIVINGTON

HAVE THE FOLLOWING WORKS NEARLY READY
FOR PUBLICATION.

I.

THE SACRED CALENDAR OF PROPHECY.

By GEORGE STANLEY FABER, B.D.

Rector of Long Newton.

In 3 vols. 8vo.

II.

A DESCRIPTION of the ANTIQUITIES and other CURIOSITIES
of ROME, from Personal Observation, made during a Visit to Italy in the
Years 1818-19. With Illustrations from Ancient and Modern Writers.

8vo. Second Edition, with numerous Additions.

By the Rev. EDWARD BURTON, M.A.

Late Student of Christ Church College, Oxford.

III.

A SECOND SERIES OF DISCOURSES,

Preached before the UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE. 8vo.

By HUGH JAMES ROSE, B.D.

Vicar of Horsham, Sussex.

IV.

An ABRIDGMENT of the HISTORY of the REFORMATION of the
CHURCH OF ENGLAND. In 12mo.

By HENRY SOAMES, M.A.

Rector of Shelley, in Essex.

V.

A TREATISE ON ALGEBRA.

By the Rev. GEORGE PEACOCK, A.M. F.R.S. F.G.S.

Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge.

In 8vo. With PLATES.

VI.

On the EVIDENCES of NATURAL and REVEALED RELIGION.

By the late Rev. Dr. GERARD.

In 8vo.

VII.

AN HISTORICAL INQUIRY

into the probable CAUSES of the RATIONALIST CHARACTER
lately predominant in the THEOLOGY of GERMANY.

To which is prefixed

A LETTER from PROFESSOR SACK

upon the Rev. H. J. ROSE'S DISCOURSES ON GERMAN PROTESTANTISM.

Translated from the German. In 8vo.

By E. B. PUSEY, M.A.

Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.

VIII.

THE PSALTER OF DAVID:

With TITLES and COLLECTS, according to the matter of each Psalm;
and DEVOTIONS for General Use. 12mo.

By the Right Reverend JEREMY TAYLOR, D.D.
Late Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore.

IX.

SERMONS

By the Rev. HENRY REVELL,
Curate of Coleford, Gloucestershire.
In 8vo.

X.

A THIRD EDITION OF THE

Rev. J. R. PITMAN'S EXCERPTA ex variis ROMANIS POETIS,
qui in Scholiis rarius leguntur. Notis illustrata. 12mo.

XI.

A SECOND EDITION OF

A SERIES of DISCOURSES on the STATE of the PROTESTANT
RELIGION in GERMANY.

Preached before the University of Cambridge, in 1825. In 8vo.

By HUGH JAMES ROSE, B.D.
Vicar of Horsham, Sussex.

XII.

The ROMAN EMPIRE, under CONSTANTINE the GREAT.

By MATTHEW BRIDGES, Esq. In 8vo. 12s.

XIII.

A NEW EDITION OF

The CLERICAL GUIDE, or ECCLESIASTICAL DIRECTORY.

Containing a complete Register of all the BENEFICES in ENGLAND and
WALES, arranged alphabetically; with the Names of their INCUMBENTS.

Corrected to 1828. In 8vo.

XIV.

SERMONS

For the KITCHEN and the SERVANTS' HALL.

By the Rev. W. DOWNES WILLIS, M.A.
Vicar of Kirkby in Cleveland. 12mo.

XV.

The BETROTHED LOVERS. A Milanese Tale of the 17th Century.

Translated from the Italian of ALESSANDRO MANZONI.

In Three Vols. Post 8vo.

XVI.

A NEW AND IMPROVED EDITION OF

DEBRETT'S BARONETAGE OF ENGLAND,

uniform with the PEERAGE.

XVII.

A THIRD EDITION OF

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR;

Thoughts in Verse for the Sundays and Holidays throughout the Year. In 8vo.

WORKS JUST PUBLISHED

BY

C. & J. RIVINGTON.

I.

The HISTORY of the REFORMATION of the CHURCH of
ENGLAND. The FOURTH and CONCLUDING VOLUME.

Containing the Reigns of Queens MARY and ELIZABETH. 8vo. 18s.

By HENRY SOAMES, M.A.

Rector of Shelley, in Essex.

This Work may now be had complete in 4 Vols. 8vo. 2l. 4s.

II.

ÆSCHYLI TRAGÆDIE SEPTEM.

Cum FRAGMENTIS et INDICIBUS. Recensuit suasque Notulas adjecit

JACOBUS SCHOLEFIELD, A.M.

Græc. Lit. Professor Regius Cantab.

8vo. 10s.

III.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICES of the APOSTLES, EVANGELISTS,
and other SAINTS. With Reflections, adapted to the Minor Festivals
of the Church. In 8vo. 13s.

By the Right Rev. RICHARD MANT, D.D.

Lord Bishop of Down and Connor.

IV.

An ANALYTICAL SYSTEM of CONIC SECTIONS,

Designed for the Use of Students in the University of Cambridge. In 8vo. 9s.

By the Rev. H. P. HAMILTON, M.A. F.R.S. Lond. and Edinb.

Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

V.

The APOCALYPSE of St. JOHN,

Or a Prophecy of the Rise, Progress, and Fall of the Church of Rome; the Inqui-
sition; the French Revolution; the Universal War; and the Final Triumph of
Christianity. Being a New Interpretation. Second Edition. 8vo. 12s.

By the Rev. GEORGE CROLY, M.A. H.R.S.L.

VI.

The DOCTRINE of the GREEK ARTICLE,

Applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the NEW TESTAMENT.

By the Right Rev. T. FANSHAWE MIDDLETON, D.D.

Late Lord Bishop of Calcutta.

SECOND EDITION, REVISED,

By the Rev. J. SCHOLEFIELD, A.M.

Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge.

8vo. 16s.

VII.

The HOLY WEEK ;

or the Passion of our Blessed Saviour, (with a Supplement for Easter,) taken from
Dean Stanhope's Paraphrase and Comment on the Epistles and Gospels
in the Liturgy of the Church of England.

12mo. 5s.

VIII.

MILITARY REFLECTIONS on TURKEY.

By BARON VON VALENTINI,
Major General in the Prussian Service.

Translated by a MILITARY OFFICER.

In 8vo. With a Map. 6s.

IX.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS,

Illustrative of the Importance of the Revelation of God in JESUS CHRIST.

By the Rev. RENN D. HAMPDEN, A.M.
Late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.

12mo. 7s. 6d.

X.

THE FIFTH EDITION OF

A CRITICAL and PRACTICAL ELUCIDATION of the BOOK of
COMMON PRAYER.

By the late Rev. J. SHEPHERD, M.A.
Minister of Pattiswick, Essex.

2 vols. 8vo. 18s.

XI.

A MANUAL OF ELECTRO-DYNAMICS,

Chiefly Translated from the Treatise on the Mutual Action of Electric Conductors
and Magnets of J. F. DEMONFERRAND, with Notes and Additions,
comprehending the latest Discoveries and Improvements.

By J. CUMMING, M.A. F.R.S. and C.S.
Professor of Chemistry, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

In 8vo. With PLATES. 12s.

XII.

The HULSEAN LECTURES for 1827,

On the Proofs of Divine Power and Wisdom derived from the Study of
Astronomy: and on the Evidence, Doctrines and Precepts of
Revealed Religion. 8vo. 12s.

By the Rev. TEMPLE CHEVALLIER, M.A.
Late Fellow and Tutor of Catharine Hall.

XIII.

A COURSE of LESSONS for INFANT SCHOOLS :

together with the TUNES to which they are usually sung ; and also a Copious Col-
lection of HYMNS and MORAL SONGS, suitable for Infant Instruction,
either in Schools or in Private Families. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

XIV.

SERMONS on SICKNESS, SORROW and DEATH.

By the Rev. EDWARD BERENS, M.A.

12mo. 2s.

XV.

The MOHAMMEDAN SYSTEM of THEOLOGY;
or a Compendious Survey of the History and Doctrines of Islamism, contrasted
with Christianity; together with Remarks on the Prophecies relative to its
Dissolution. 8vo. 10s.

By the Rev. W. H. NEALE, A.M.
Chaplain of the County Bridewell, Gosport, Hants.

XVI.

An APPENDIX to the STATE of the PROTESTANT RELIGION
in GERMANY. Being a Reply to the German Critiques on that Work.

By HUGH JAMES ROSE, B.D.
Vicar of Horsham, Sussex.

8vo. 3s. 6d.

XVII.

A SECOND EDITION OF

The PRIMER; a BOOK of PRIVATE PRAYER,
needful to all Christians; which was authorized and set forth by order of King
Edward the Sixth, to be Taught, Learned, Read and Used, by all his Subjects.

Edited by the Rev. H. WALTER, B.D. F.R.S.
Late Fellow of St. John's Coll. Camb.

12mo. 3s.

XVIII.

A SECOND SELECTION from the PAPERS of ADDISON,
in the SPECTATOR and GUARDIAN. 12mo. 5s. 6d.

By the Rev. E. BERENS, M.A.

XIX.

TWENTY PLAIN and PRACTICAL SERMONS,
delivered to a Country Congregation, by a late Rector of a Country Parish.
Revised from the Original MSS.,

By His SON-IN-LAW, a VILLAGE CURATE.

12mo. 5s. 6d.

XX.

An EXPOSITION of the MORNING, EVENING, and COMMU-
NION SERVICES, in the LITURGY of the CHURCH of ENGLAND.

In Thirteen Lectures. 12mo. 5s.

By the Rev. EDWARD PATTESON, M.A.

XXI.

A SECOND EDITION OF

A SERIES of REFLECTIONS on the SACRED ORATORIO of
the MESSIAH; with short Expository Remarks and Illustrations,
Compiled from a larger Work on the same Subject.

By a LADY. 18mo. 2s. 6d.

XXII.

BRIEF NOTICES OF SCRIPTURE CHARACTERS,
selected from the Old Testament. Republished from the Cottager's Monthly
Visitor. 18mo. 1s. 6d.

XXIII.

A COLLECTION of PRAYERS,
for Household Use, with a few Hymns and other Poems. 12mo. 5s. 6d.

XXIV.

TWENTY-FIVE SERMONS,
Preached to the Inmates of a Gaol, and in a great degree adapted to a
Country Congregation. In 12mo. 6s.

By the Rev. JOHN CLAY,
Chaplain to the House of Correction, Preston.

XXV.

RECENSIO SYNOPTICA ANNOTATIONIS SACRÆ:
Or CRITICAL DIGEST of the most important ANNOTATIONS, Exegetical,
Philological, and Theological, on the New Testament.
In Eight large vols. 8vo. Price 6l. 2s.

By the Rev. S. T. BLOOMFIELD, A.M.
Vicar of Bisbrook, Rutland.

This Work is especially adapted to the use of Academical Students, Candidates for Holy Orders, Ministers, and all who have any knowledge of the original Greek. It has been the author's endeavour to establish the true sense, not only by a diligent use of the most eminent modern commentators, but by regularly exploring the fountain heads of interpretation, as found in the Fathers and Greek Commentators. Every apposite illustration of phraseology or sentiment to be found in a laborious examination of the immense collectanea, both of the classical and rabbinical illustrators, especially Wetstein's New Testament, has been selected. The very valuable materials derived from these, and various other sources, have been carefully digested and moulded into one Corpus Exegeseos, in which each portion is, as far as possible, ascribed to its respective author, and the foreign matter (for the first time) translated into English. With the whole is interwoven a series of critical remarks by the Editor, intended to guide the judgment of the student amidst the diversities of jarring interpretations; and a very copious body of original annotations, in which the true reading is, in all important cases, discussed, the connexion traced, the course of reasoning indicated; and, in general, whatever seemed necessary to complete the Corpus Exegeseos, has been supplied by the Editor, who has further consulted the convenience of students by forming a series of glossarial notes on every word and phrase presenting the slightest difficulty, and giving a new literal translation, and close paraphrase, on most of the sentences annotated on.

From the vast extensiveness of plan, and wide scope of research, in the above elaborate work, it manifestly forms by far the most valuable body of exegetical matter ever yet laid before the public, and comprehends whatever is essential to the interpretation of the New Testament.

* * The *Second Part* (containing the Acts and Epistles, and an Appendix to Part I.) in Five Volumes, may be had to complete sets, price 4l. in boards.

XXVI.

The OXFORD UNIVERSITY CALENDAR,
for the Year 1828. 12mo. 6s.

XXVII.

OUTLINE MAPS of EUROPE, ASIA, AFRICA, AMERICA, and
the WORLD. 1s. each.

By the Rev B. DONNE, A.M.

XXVIII.

A NEW CATALOGUE of MODERN WORKS in THEOLOGY
and GENERAL LITERATURE.

In 8vo.

CONTENTS

OF

N^o. VI.



	PAGE
ART. I. An Introduction to the Writings of the New Testament. By Dr. John Leonard Hug, Professor of Theology in the University of Freyburgh, in Breisgau, &c. Trans- lated from the Original German, by the Rev. Daniel Guildford Wait, LL.D.	257
II. Ewing's Greek and English Dictionary.	317
III. The Nature and Extent of the Christian Dispensation, with reference to the Salvability of the Heathen. By Edward William Grinfield, M.A.	326
IV. 1. Historical Inquiries respecting the Character of Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, Lord Chancellor of England. By the Hon. George Agar Ellis. 2. The Correspondence and Diaries of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, and Lawrence Hyde, Earl of Rochester ; published from the Original MSS. with Notes. By S. W. Singer, F.S.A.	363
V. A Connection of Sacred and Profane History, from the Death of Joshua to the Decline of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah. By the Rev. Michael Russell, LL.D. Episcopal Minister, Leith.	395
VI. The Celtic Druids. By Godfrey Higgins, Esq. F.S.A.	420
VII. 1. Declarations of the Catholic Bishops, the Vicars Apos- tolic, and their Co-adjutors in Great Britain. 2. Review of a Pamphlet, entitled, "Declaration of the Catholic Bishops, the Vicars Apostolic, and their Co-	

ART.	PAGE
adjutors, in Great Britain ;" paragraph by paragraph. To which is added, An Appeal to the Roman Catholic Laity, who signed " An Address to their Protestant Fellow Countrymen," founded upon that Declaration. By the Rev. George Townsend, M.A. Prebendary of Durham, and Vicar of Northallerton, &c.	
3. The Protestant Dissenters' Catechism ; — containing 1. A Brief History of the Dissenters; 2. The Reasons of Dissent from the National Church. The Nineteenth Edition. With an Appendix and Prefaces, by William Newman, D.D.	
4. The Case between the Church and the Dissenters impartially and practically considered. By the Rev. Francis Merewether, M.A. Rector of Cole Orton, Vicar of Whitwell, and Chaplain to the Most Noble the Marquis of Lansdowne.	441
VIII. The Doctrine and Law of Marriage, Adultery, and Divorce; exhibiting a Theological and Practical View of the Divine Institution of Marriage; the Religious Ratification of Marriage; the Impediments which preclude and vitiate the Contract of Marriage; the reciprocal Duties of Husbands and Wives; the sinful and criminal Character of Adultery; and the Difficulties which embarrass the Principle and Practice of Divorce: with an Appendix, containing an Essay on the Hellenistic and Ecclesiastical Meaning of the Word ΠΟΡΝΕΙΑ, ordinarily translated Fornication. By Hector Davies Morgan, M.A. of Trinity College, Oxford; Minister of Castle Hedingham, Essex.	455
IX. A Letter to the Right Honourable Robert Peel, on the Subject of the London University. By Christianus.	485
State of the Dioceses in England and Wales	494
Proceedings of the Universities	504

THE
BRITISH CRITIC,
QUARTERLY
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
AND
Ecclesiastical Record.

VOLUME VI.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR C. J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL;
AND
SOLD BY BELL AND BRADFUTE, EDINBURGH; AND
MILLIKEN, DUBLIN.

1829.

London: Printed by C. Roworth,
Bell-yard, Temple-bar.

XXIII 65 THE

BRITISH CRITIC,
Quarterly Theological Review,
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

APRIL, 1828.

ART. I.—*An Introduction to the Writings of the New Testament.*

By Dr. John Leonard Hug, Professor of Theology in the University of Freyburgh, in Breisgau, &c. Translated from the Original German, by the Rev. Daniel Guildford Wait, LL.D.
2 vols. London. 1827. 1l. 12s.

IN a former number we made some animadversions upon Professor Schleiermacher's Critical Essay upon the Gospel of St. Luke; and if the translators of German works should continue to make this new school of Divinity accessible to the English reader, we may feel ourselves called upon to expose more fallacies, and to caution our readers against more misstatements. The work, which is now before us, proceeds from the same fertile *officina* of theoretical Divinity, and is, in every respect, a genuine German work: but it stands almost alone in being intended as an antidote to the sceptical writings of that country, and in inventing theories and systems, not to undermine, but to uphold the authenticity of the New Testament.

Professor Hug is a member of the Romish Church; and though in some places we perceive the influence which this has had upon his work, he is, upon the whole, much more fair and unprejudiced than we should have expected to find him. The shackles in which the decrees of that Church hold all her sons have made him very cautious, and, consequently, deficient in his account of the Vulgate translation; though, in treating of the older Latin versions, and of the other ancient translations, particularly the Syriac, he has shown much acuteness, as well as research. In speaking of that prodigy of typographical blunders, the Bible of Pope Sixtus V., he evidently shares the feeling which the Protestant reader entertains at the plan devised by Bellarmin, to remove the

blame from the infallible Pontiff upon the unhappy printer. At vol. i. p. 302, he speaks with evident satisfaction of the Councils of Constance and Basle having opposed the Transalpine doctrines. At vol. ii. p. 564, he allows St. James to have taken precedence of St. Peter at the Apostolic Council; and we, perhaps, should mention it as an instance of fairness, that he interprets Babylon in the Revelations to be the city of Rome.

But these are comparatively minor points. We rejoice to see Professor Hug setting himself against the sceptical mania of his countrymen, exposing the unsoundness of their theories, and rescuing the New Testament from the secret and open attacks, which every part of it has sustained. In this point of view we could say of the Professor, *Utinam noster esset*. His arguments, in favour of the authenticity of the New Testament, from the acknowledgments of the early Heretics, are drawn out with ingenuity and learning; and the mass of evidence which he has collected, concerning the prevalence of the Greek language in Palestine, is sufficient to convince every unprejudiced mind that the Apostles wrote in that language. He has also shown great research and depth of reading in his descriptions of the MSS. of the New Testament. The biblical scholar may derive much information from this part of the work; though, like the rest of his countrymen, he indulges in a theory of his own concerning the different families of MSS. He conceives that the text of the New Testament, during the first two centuries, had admitted many alterations and corruptions, so that different MSS. varied exceedingly from one another (vol. i. p. 134—190.) This state of the text he calls the *κοινή ἐκδοσις*, which he thinks to be represented in a great measure in the Cambridge MS., (p. 138, &c.) At length Origen, in the third century, undertook a revision of the text, (pp. 191, 217,) in which he was followed at different intervals by Hesychius and Lucian, (pp. 197, 203.) These three recensions of the text form the peculiar theory of Hug: and since there is no improbability, *a priori*, that such recensions should have been made by pious and learned men, we cannot but regret that so pretty a theory should rest on so fragile a basis. Hug allows that there is not a trace in Origen's own works, of his having undertaken such a task as comparing and revising the MSS. of the New Testament: the only passage in which there is any allusion to it asserts directly the contrary, (p. 194,) and Hug is obliged to conclude, that "probably it was the last of his undertakings." The evidence is equally deficient concerning any recension of the New Testament being made by Hesychius and Lucian: it is stated by Jerom and others, that these two persons employed themselves, like Origen, upon revising the Greek version of the Old Testa-

ment; but that the text of the New Testament was ever so systematically divided into these three recensions, is a position which was first brought to light, and will perhaps expire with Professor Hug.

If we examine the Professor as a critic, or as a scholar, we have some doubt as to the extent of his powers. We have seldom met with a worse attempt at explaining St. Matthew's genealogy of our Saviour than that which he offers at vol. ii. p. 267, &c. From St. John's expression in his Second Epistle, v. 12, "Having many things to write unto you, I would not write with paper and ink;" and from a similar expression in his Third Epistle, v. 13, Hug infers that St. John meant to complain of a want of writing materials, (vol. ii. p. 256, 7,) and actually uses this argument to prove that at the time of writing the Third Epistle, "he was still living in the same miserable place." With respect to the Epistle of St. James, he infers from i. 6, and iii. 4, that the writer's native land was situated not far from the sea: from iii. 12, that it was blessed with fertile productions; and from v. 17, 18, that it was formerly very much exposed to droughts. Before we conclude, we shall produce some equally successful specimens of his verbal criticisms; and we trust that we are not unfair when we say, that this method of reasoning is by no means peculiar to Hug, but pervades all the theologians of the German school.

Since we wish now to call the attention of our readers to the Chronology of the New Testament, in which we shall occasionally have to express our dissent from Hug, we shall not at present mention any more of his peculiar theories. We cannot, however, forbear saying a few words as to the merits of his translator. Dr. Wait is evidently well versed in the Eastern languages; and is in possession of a store of rabbinical learning, which is often brought to bear upon Biblical Criticism. We are bound also to suppose that he imagines himself to have added to his stock of languages a knowledge of German; or he would never have undertaken the wearisome task of translating such a bulky work. But, if we were to judge from the execution of this labour, the niceties, and even the common terms of the German language, are points to which he has not yet directed his attention. In his preface to this translation, which extends through 200 pages, his English style is not exactly a model of perfection: but we might fill many pages with sentences from his translation which possess neither grammar nor sense; from which we should be at an utter loss, without the context, to elicit any meaning; and which, when compared with the original, present any thing rather than an adequate representation of the German Professor's sentiments. We have only room for a few instances of this kind; but they will be suffi-

cient to demonstrate to any of our readers who understand German, that they have in this respect no small advantage over the editor of these two volumes.

Hug observes, that the Heretics of the two first centuries bear testimony to many books of the New Testament, and he adds, "We may picture to ourselves in what a brilliant light this external testimony might have been placed, if the good intention of destroying [these Heretical works] had only chanced to meet with less success." *Man stelle sich nun vor, wie glänzend der äussere Beweiss hergestellt werden könnte, wenn es hier dem guten Willen, zu zerstören, nur etwas weniger gelungen wäre, glücklich zu seyn.* This is translated by Dr. Wait as follows, "We may imagine how brilliantly the external proofs might be restored, if, where it was determined to destroy, some small part alone was preserved." Vol. i. p. 93.

In the following page Hug is speaking of the credibility of the New Testament, and says, that he is not yet come to the proper time for discussing so important a question: "In the mean time, what has been effected upon this subject by learned men, such as Less and Paley, is well known; but does not admit of any abridgment suitable to the extent of these pages, even if we were arrived at the time for discussing the question." The latter part of the sentence is, in the original, *aber ist keines Auszuges fähig, der dem Umfange dieser Blätter entspräche, wenn es auch an der zeit dazu wäre*; which is thus translated by Dr. Wait: "But it is in the power of no extract to contradict the extent of these pages, even if it were of the same date"!!!

The following instance is rather amusing. Dr. Wait writes at p. 344: "We are more early informed by Cosmas, an Egyptian scholar, known in the middle of the sixth century by his Oriental Voyages of the Indian Sailor, &c." Our readers, without having the original words before them, would probably guess the true meaning to be—"Cosmas, called *Indicopleustes* from his Eastern Voyages." *Von seinen orientalischen Reisen der Indienfahrer genannt.*

Sometimes we are able to trace the origin of Dr. Wait's unfortunate mistakes. Thus at vol. ii. p. 132, he represents Hug as saying: "That which individually concerned the person of Peter, and where he stood in the narrative, as the one chiefly reproached, was more concisely treated [by St. Mark]." Most critics have observed the exact contrary to this; and so did Hug, who makes use of the word *Hauptvorwurf*. Dr. Wait looked into his dictionary, and found that *Vorwurf* signifies *Reproach*: but if he had examined farther, he would have found that it also means *an object or subject*; and *Hauptvorwurf* signifies *the principal or*

leading object. The same word *Vorwurf* has again been a stumbling block to Dr. Wait at p. 502, where, contrary to all sense, he translates it *objection*.

We forbear to say anything more of Dr. Wait as a translator ; for being ourselves rather inclined to deprecate the diffusion of German divinity in England, we are not sorry to see absurdities rendered unintelligible, or to find mischievous doctrines become harmless by being clothed in language which is purely enigmatical.

We are far however from meaning to say, that Professor Hug is either absurd or mischievous, and we must now return to a consideration of his book. Several pages of it are devoted to the chronology of the Acts of the Apostles. He has also attempted to settle the dates of all the books of the New Testament ; and since to follow him through the whole of this part of his work would require much more time than we can at present spare, we shall confine ourselves to that part of the chronology which concerns the travels and the writings of St. Paul.

In settling the chronology of the Acts of the Apostles, it becomes necessary to fix the date of the crucifixion of our Saviour ; and this cannot be done without some regard being had to the year of his birth. We need not inform our readers, that most chronologists are now agreed, that what is called the vulgar era is erroneous, and that Christ was born a few years before the commencement of that era. Without entering into their different theories, we would begin our calculation with the plain and simple evidence which the Scripture supplies. St. Luke tells us, that the word of the Lord came to John the Baptist in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius (iii. 1, 2), and that Jesus at the time of his baptism was about thirty years old, (iii. 23). The fifteenth year of Tiberius began in the twenty-eighth year of the vulgar era, on the 19th of August : and since it appears from all the Evangelists, that our Saviour was not baptized till John had been exercising his ministry for some time, it is most probable that he was baptized early in the year 29. If the tradition of his being born at the end of December be correct, this probability would be increased ; since the Evangelist speaks of his *beginning* to be 30 years old ; and we know from Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Jerom, and others, that there was a notion in ancient times that he was baptized at the beginning of January. If then we suppose Jesus to have reached his thirtieth year in the December of 28, and if we reckon backward from that period to the year of his birth, it brings us to the third year before the vulgar era ; or in other words, Jesus was born in the forty-first year of the reign of

Augustus. This is the conclusion, to which we should come, if we merely follow the words of St. Luke; and if we proceed to bring this conclusion to the test of ancient authority, we find Irenæus expressly saying, that Christ was born about the forty-first year of the reign of Augustus (iii. 21). Tertullian says the same thing (c. Jud. p. 190), and Clement of Alexandria agrees with them, since he makes Christ to have been born in the twenty-eighth year of the reign of Augustus (p. 406-7); for Clement reckoned the years of his reign from the victory at Actium, and the twenty-eighth year in this calculation coincides with the forty-first year from the death of Julius Cæsar. Thus far our conclusion is supported by ancient authority. It is also necessary for the accuracy of this date, that it should precede by about a year the death of Herod the Great: and though Josephus does not enable us to name the precise year in which that event happened, it is demonstrable from his narrative that Herod did not die before the forty-first of Augustus; and there are many reasons to make us believe that he actually died in the forty-second.

Having fixed the birth of Christ to the forty-first year of the reign of Augustus, or the third year before the vulgar era, we may proceed to consider the date of his crucifixion. We have supposed him to have been baptized early in the year 29; and whatever commentators may have said, we can never believe that the Evangelists speak of his having attended more than three passovers after the commencement of his ministry. These are mentioned in John, ii. 13; vi. 4; and xi. 55. The reasoning of Hug appears to us convincing, that the feast mentioned in John v. 1, cannot have been a passover; since the events described in the 5th chapter are not enough to have occupied a year; and at the beginning of the 6th chapter there is express mention of a passover. We have therefore supposed our Saviour to have been baptized early in 29, and not long after to have attended the passover mentioned in John, ii. 13. In the following year he attended another passover, John, vi. 4; and in the year 31 he attended the third passover, John, xi. 55, at which he was crucified. Here again we have ancient authorities on our side. Irenæus expressly states that our Saviour attended three passovers (ii. 22), though what he says in the same chapter, of his having continued on earth till his fiftieth year, has puzzled the commentators, and induced some of them to suspect the passage to be corrupt. It is well known also, that not only the Valentinian heretics, but many ecclesiastical writers, supposed our Saviour's ministry to have continued only one year. Clement of Alexandria (p. 407) and Tertullian (p. 191) deliver this opinion; and Origen, in one place (vol. i. p. 160), speaks of it having lasted one year and a

few months. There is no difficulty in explaining the origin of this notion. Our Saviour's ministry did in fact occupy only one entire year : he began his ministry in the year preceding, and in that which followed he was put to death. Hence Origen speaks of his teaching for the space of one year and a few months ; though in another place (vol. iii. p. 970,) he seems to think this notion incorrect ; and at p. 859, he expressly says that our Saviour's preaching lasted almost three years, a statement which we consider to be nearly true. We shall have occasion to show presently, that Jerom also placed the crucifixion in the year 31 ; and since the calculations which we have made from the plain and literal interpretation of the Evangelists thus leads us to a date which is confirmed by such a host of ancient authorities, we have little hesitation in concluding that our Saviour suffered in the year 31 of the vulgar era.

There are many events mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, which might appear at first sight likely to throw light upon the chronology of that book ; but if we examine them closely, it will appear that there is only one which can be settled with positive accuracy. The death of Herod Agrippa is mentioned, xii. 19—23 ; and we are enabled from Josephus to ascertain the exact date of that event. Josephus marks the death of Agrippa in more than one place with greater precision than is usual with him, (*Antiq.* xix. 8, 2 ; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 11, 6 ;) and we learn from one of these places, that the king died when Claudius had completed his third year. Claudius began his reign in January, 41 ; consequently he had completed the third year in January, 44. In this year, according to Josephus, Agrippa died. It might be said, perhaps, that St. Luke does not relate the death of Agrippa exactly in the order of time, but that many events may have taken place between the imprisonment of Peter, mentioned in Acts, xii. 3—19, and the death of Agrippa in 20—23. This is certainly not impossible ; but there is nothing in St. Luke's words which would lead us to such a conclusion : on the contrary, they seem clearly to point out that Agrippa went to Cæsarea immediately after the imprisonment of Peter, and died there shortly after. Nearly all chronologists have taken this view of the subject, and agree with Hug in supposing that Agrippa died in some part of the same year in which James was killed, and Peter imprisoned. We have seen above that this was in the year 44 of our era ; which enables us to fix the date of St. Paul's visit to Jerusalem, when he went there with contributions from the Christians of Antioch, Acts, xi. 30.

Even if we suppose St. Luke not to have related the death of Agrippa in the order of time, still we have grounds for assigning the year 44 as the date of St. Paul's journey to Jerusalem on that

occasion; for though there was more than one scarcity in the reign of Claudius, it is generally supposed that the one which was predicted by Agabus, xi. 28, and which was the cause of Paul and Barnabas going to Jerusalem, was the same with that mentioned by Josephus, (*Antiq.* xx. 2.) as being felt severely at Jerusalem; and this appears to be placed by him in the fourth year of Claudius, which again brings us to the year 44.

By measuring back fourteen years from this period, or rather from the second year after, as we shall see presently, we learn the date of St. Paul's first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion; for he tells us, Gal. ii. 1, that he went again to Jerusalem with Barnabas after an interval of fourteen years. It might be thought from these words, that the second visit which he ever made to Jerusalem was fourteen years after the first. The next visit mentioned in the Acts, is when he went to Jerusalem with contributions, xi. 30, and Barnabas was then with him. But he says, Gal. ii. 2, that at the visit which was made fourteen years after the first he recounted *how he had preached the Gospel to the Gentiles*. Now St. Paul had certainly not done this previous to his visit in 44; but after his first tour he went again to Jerusalem, and Barnabas was with him, xv. 4. This was on occasion of the question about the Jewish converts; and it is expressly said, that when they were in Jerusalem they related *what things God had done by them*; which agrees closely with the words quoted above from Gal. ii. 2. We therefore take this to be the visit alluded to in Gal. ii. 1: and St. Paul does not say that it was his *second* visit, but διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν πάλιν ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα, "after fourteen years I made another journey to Jerusalem;" and it was not unnatural for him to pass over the second, because it afforded no incident connected with the subject upon which he was then writing to the Galatians.

Since this third visit enables us to fix with tolerable accuracy the date of St. Paul's conversion, it becomes of the greatest importance that we should ascertain the exact date of the third visit. But in doing this, chronologists and critics have differed greatly. Hug fixes it in the year 53; but the generality of writers place it in 49. Among those who support the latter opinion, we may name Petavius, Pearson, Lardner, Hales, Michaelis, Paley, Barrington, Tomline, and Townsend. Notwithstanding this powerful array of authorities, considerable difficulties attend the assigning the year 49 to the third visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem. From the narrative of St. Luke, it would appear that Paul and Barnabas returned from Jerusalem to Antioch soon after St. Peter's release from imprisonment, *i. e.* as we have seen above, in the year 44; and this is the opinion of Michaelis. Town-

send, however, makes them return in 45, so that they must have staid a whole year in Jerusalem. He supposes them to have set out on their first journey in this same year; and it is in the dates assigned to their progress in this journey that we feel disposed to differ from Townsend and the writers whom he follows. We would ask any person to read the history of this journey as recorded in Acts, xiii. 4—xiv. 26, and to say whether they can reasonably imagine that it took up the space of four years, *i. e.* from 45 to 48 inclusive. This is the supposition of Townsend; and Hug, who places St. Paul's third visit to Jerusalem in 53, must have conceived his journey to have occupied at least four years, if not much more; though he does not specify the year in which he supposes the journey to have commenced.

If we examine this arrangement in detail, we shall find it almost impossible to adopt it. It supposes Paul and Barnabas to have arrived at Perga at the end of the year 45; to have occupied the whole of 46 in going to Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium and Lystra; to have passed another year in returning through Iconium to Antioch in Pisidia; and to come home to Antioch in Syria in the year following. We have no hesitation in saying that these periods of time are greatly too long; and if we had read the Acts without knowing anything of the opinions of others, we should certainly have imagined that the whole journey occupied only part of one year, and that Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch before winter. It is to be remarked that Townsend himself, in settling the dates of St. Paul's second journey, makes him to have travelled through the whole of Asia Minor, and to have reached Thessalonica before the expiration of one year; though in the first journey he conceived four years to be taken up in a less extensive tour; and though the words of St. Luke do not in the least lead us to imagine that the Apostles tarried longer in the first expedition than in the second. Upon the whole we have little hesitation in saying, that this first journey of St. Paul occupied only part of one year; in which we are supported by Usher and Petavius, though those two writers assign a different year for the journey being made; Usher placing it in 45 and Petavius in 42. Capellus also conceived little more than one year to have been occupied in this first journey; but he is guilty of a similar inconsistency with Townsend, for he makes the second journey to occupy part of five years. The Apostles, perhaps, passed the remainder of the year 44, after their return from Jerusalem, at Antioch; and early in 45 they were called by the Holy Ghost to undertake the conversion of the Gentiles, as recorded in Acts, xiii. 2, and set out upon their journey. If so, the journey of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, mentioned xv. 3, and which

certainly took place in the year after their first tour, happened in 46. We may perhaps quote St. Paul's own words in support of this part of our chronology. Writing to the Philippians from Rome, and reminding them of the first visit which he paid to them, he speaks of having come to them "in the beginning of the Gospel," (iv. 15,) ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. According to Townsend and those whom he follows, St. Paul went to Philippi for the first time A.D. 50; but since they suppose him to have begun his preaching in the year 45, he could hardly speak of the year 50 as *the beginning* of the Gospel; whereas, according to our own chronology, he first began to preach in 45, and arrived at Philippi in 46.

If we date back fourteen years from the year 46 inclusive, it brings us to the year 33, which must be the time of St. Paul's first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion. It might have been thought from the Acts, ix. 19. 23. 26. that St. Paul went to Jerusalem shortly after his conversion: but he expressly tells us in Gal. i. 17, 18, that he did not go to Jerusalem till three years after that event: so that if he was at Jerusalem in 33, as proved above, his conversion took place in the year 30 or 31, according as we suppose St. Paul to have counted the years inclusively or exclusively. The expression in Gal. ii. 1, is διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν, and if we look to a similar phrase, which is used by St. Matthew, xxvi. 61, and St. Mark, xiv. 58, διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν, we may conclude that St. Paul intended to count the fourteen years inclusively, *i. e.* he spoke of twelve entire years and part of two other years. We therefore fix his conversion in 31.

The events which followed his conversion may be thus arranged:

A.D. 31.—It is not improbable that Saul received his commission to go to Damascus soon after Easter. A journey from Jerusalem to Damascus would require some days, and he was near to Damascus when he saw the vision. For three days after the vision he was blind, ix. 9. Ananias went to him on the third or fourth day after his conversion, ix. 17. Paul passed *some days* in Damascus, ix. 19, perhaps a week or two, since he preached in the synagogues, and probably on the sabbaths, ix. 20. 22. We may suppose that he staid there till Pentecost: he then went into Arabia, Gal. i. 17, and staid there great part of three years, *i. e.* one whole year and part of two others.

A.D. 32.—St. Paul in Arabia.

A.D. 33.—He returned to Damascus, Gal. i. 17. We have supposed the greater part of these three years to be passed in Arabia, (and such is the opinion of Benson,) though St. Paul's words might allow them to have been passed in Damascus.

After that many days were fulfilled, the Jews took counsel to kill him, ix. 23; and he escaped by being let down in a basket, and went to Jerusalem, ix. 26; Gal. i. 18. He staid in Jerusalem fifteen days, Gal. i. 18; and had the vision mentioned, xxii. 17. From Jerusalem he went to Cæsarea, and thence to Tarsus, ix. 30, where he staid till Barnabas brought him to Antioch in the year 43; nor do we know anything of what happened to him in this interval, except that, according to our calculations, the vision to which he alludes, 2 Cor. xii. 2, must have come to him about the year 38, or eight years after his conversion.

A.D. 43.—Barnabas brought Paul from Tarsus to Antioch, xi. 25. They staid there a year, 26, which brings us to the beginning of 44; and we may now proceed with the remaining chronology of the Acts, from St. Paul's second visit to Jerusalem to the end of the book.

A.D. 44.—Paul and Barnabas went to Jerusalem, xi. 30, before Easter, xii. 3. James put to death, xii. 1. Peter imprisoned, 3. Herod Agrippa dies, 23. Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch; John Mark was with them, 25.

A.D. 45.—Paul and Barnabas set out upon their first journey, probably after the feast of Pentecost, or early in June: reach Seleucia (fifteen miles) in a day, and Cyprus in two days more, xiii. 4: a week in Cyprus, and probably a sabbath, 5: the next sabbath was spent at Antioch in Pisidia, 14, and another sabbath after that, 44: which allows time for the Gospel to spread through the whole country, 49, and for the Jews to raise a persecution, 50: perhaps three weeks or a month in all. To Iconium in two days, 51: staid there *ἱκανὸν χρόνον*, perhaps a week, xiv. 3: went to Lystra, Derbe and the country round about, 6: long enough at Derbe to gain several disciples, 21: this would take about three weeks. Back again to Lystra, Iconium and Antioch, 21, in about a week: through Pisidia to Pamphylia, 24, in three days: in Perga probably two days, 25: to Attalia one day, 25: sailed from Attalia to Antioch in six days, 26. We may call the whole time taken up in this journey three or four months; and they probably returned to Antioch by the end of September. They staid there *no short time*, xiv. 28: probably they wintered there.

A.D. 46.—St. Luke says that some came from Jerusalem who insisted upon the converts conforming with the Mosaic law, xv. 1: if we compare Gal. ii. 11, 12, it would seem that St. Peter was at Antioch before their arrival. Paul and Barnabas set out for Jerusalem, but appear to have travelled slowly through Phœnicia and Samaria, xv. 3: they would perhaps arrive at Jerusalem by Easter. Judas and Silas were with them, 22, and also Titus, Gal. ii. 1. Council of apostles and elders, 6. Paul and Barnabas

returned to Antioch with Judas and Silas, 30. 32. *After some time* Judas returned to Jerusalem, 33. *After some days* Barnabas and Mark sailed to Cyprus, 36. 39. Paul and Silas went through Syria and Cilicia, 40, 41, having probably set out after Pentecost, or early in June. Came to Derbe and Lystra, xvi. 1, in about three weeks: the circumcision of Timothy would detain them about another week, 3: went through the cities preaching, 4, two weeks: to Troas through Phrygia, Galatia (where he was warmly received, Gal. iv. 13—15,) and Mysia, 6. 8, in four weeks: St. Luke was with them at this time, 10: sailed to Samothrace in three days, 11; to Neapolis, *one day*, 11: to Philippi, 12, and staid there *some days*, 13, 17, including *a sabbath*, 13; perhaps six days:* to Thessalonica through Amphipolis and Apollonia, xvii. 1, three days: three sabbaths at Thessalonica, 2, perhaps seventeen days:† to Berea by night, 10: staid there *some days*, 11, perhaps over another sabbath: Silas and Timothy remain at Berea, Paul goes to Athens, 14, 15: thence to Corinth, xviii. 1. The journey from Antioch to Berea took up three months and eight days, or till the middle of September, so that St. Paul might easily reach Corinth before winter, perhaps by the beginning of November. He staid in Corinth eighteen months, xviii. 11, and was joined there by Aquila and Priscilla, 2, Silas and Timothy, 5. Soon after the arrival of the latter he wrote his First Epistle to the Thessalonians.

A.D. 47.—St. Paul at Corinth. In some part of this year he wrote his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians.

A.D. 48.—Left Corinth, xviii. 18, probably some time in April, meaning to reach Jerusalem by the feast, 21, which is supposed to be Pentecost. Sailed to Ephesus, 19, in four days, but did not stay there, 20. Aquila and Priscilla remained at Ephesus, 19. St. Paul proceeded to Cæsarea, 22, in twenty days: arrived at Jerusalem by Pentecost, 22: returned to Antioch, 22: staid there *some time*, and went through Galatia and Phrygia, 23, xix. 1, to Ephesus, xix. 1. While he was on this journey, Apollos came to Ephesus, met with Aquila and Priscilla, xviii. 24—26, and went to Corinth, 27, xix. 1. St. Paul wintered in Ephesus, and probably did not arrive there long before winter. He staid there three years, xx. 31. In whatever year he took his departure, he had intended to stay there till Pentecost, 1 Cor. xvi. 8, and this epistle was written not long before Easter, v. 8, perhaps in March;

* It appears that St. Luke remained at Philippi.

† Benson endeavours to prove that St. Paul must have staid much longer than three weeks at Thessalonica. But St. Luke's specification of three sabbaths cannot be set aside by mere inferences. Michaelis agrees with us in fixing the time at three weeks, as do Rosenmüller and Hug.

so that he probably arrived at Ephesus about October or November, A.D. 48; and if we take the expression *three years* to mean three years and a little more, we may conceive him to have left Ephesus before Pentecost in 52.

A.D. 49, 50, 51.—St. Paul in Ephesus. It seems probable that in 51 he sailed to Crete, having touched at Corinth: and upon returning back to Ephesus wrote to Titus, and perhaps wintered at Nicopolis, but returned to Ephesus in

A.D. 52.—Soon after his return he wrote to the Galatians and his First Epistle to the Corinthians; and sent Timothy and Erastus to Macedonia, xix. 22: Caius and Aristarchus were with him, 29. Tumult in Ephesus, 23: St. Paul left Ephesus before Pentecost, probably in May; went to Troas, where he had expected to find Titus, (2 Cor. ii. 12, 13,) and it is probable that from this place he wrote his First Epistle to Timothy: through Macedonia (where he wrote his Second Epistle to the Corinthians,) to Greece, xx. 1, 2, where he staid *three months*, 3: probably wintered there, as he intended to do when he wrote 1 Cor. xvi. 6. His residence seems to have been at Corinth.

A.D. 53.—St. Paul, having decided to return through Macedonia, xx. 3, wrote his Epistle to the Romans from Corinth; he was at Philippi at Easter, 6. After Easter he sailed for Troas, Luke being with him, 5, and arrived there in *five days*, 6; at Troas he found Sopater, Aristarchus, Secundus, Caius, Timothy, Tychicus, and Trophimus, who had gone on first and waited for him there, 4, 5; he staid at Troas *seven days*, 6; Luke and the rest sailed to Assus, Paul went thither on foot, 13, one day; they met and went to Mitylene, 14, another day; *the next day* were off Chios, 15; *on the next* to Samos, 15; *on the next* to Miletus, 15. At Miletus he sent for the elders of Ephesus to come to him, (the distance being fifty miles,) which would take up two days, 17; from thence they sailed to Cos, xxi. 1, one day; *on the next day* to Rhodes, 1, and thence to Patara, 1, in another day; thence they sailed to Tyre, 3, probably in three days, and staid there *seven days*, 4; the voyage to Ptolemais, 7, would require one day, and they staid there *one day*, 7. Thence they went to Cæsarea, 8, one day, where they found Philip the Deacon. They staid there several days, 10, perhaps six; and from thence to Jerusalem (seventy miles) would require two days. This makes forty-three days in all, so that they would easily reach Jerusalem by Pentecost. *On the day after their arrival* they had a meeting with James, 18; and *on the day following* Paul went to the Temple with the four men who had a vow, 26, but some of the seven days appear to have already expired. (Compare xxiv. 11.) Before the remaining days were over, a tumult was raised, 27, and St. Paul

passed the day in confinement, xxiii. 10; at night he had a vision, 11. On the next day forty persons take an oath to kill Paul, 12; he is taken that night to Antipatris, 31; and on the following day to Cæsarea, where Felix the governor lived, 33. *After five days* Ananias the high priest came down to Cæsarea, and Felix brought Paul before him, xxiv. 1; this was the twelfth day since St. Paul's arrival at Jerusalem, 11. *After some days* Felix hears Paul a second time, 24, but keeps him in prison for the two remaining years of his being governor, 27.

A.D. 54.—Paul in prison at Cæsarea.

A.D. 55.—Festus succeeded Felix as governor of Judæa, xxiv. 27. The time when he entered upon his office is not mentioned. If we took St. Luke's expression of *two years* literally, St. Paul's imprisonment would have expired about twenty days after Pentecost in this year. But he was in confinement somewhat longer. The period which elapsed between the arrival of Festus and St. Paul's sailing for Italy, would occupy about forty or fifty days; (see Acts, xxv. 1. 6. 13, 14. 23; xxvii. 2,) and the *ὑστέρια* mentioned in xxvii. 9, is placed by Hug on the 2d of October, which agrees with what is said, that the ship would have wintered in Crete if there had been a good harbour. Without therefore defining accurately the time of their first setting sail, we may conclude that they left Crete some time in October. On the *third* day after this they were obliged to lighten the ship, xxvii. 19; and on the *fourteenth* night from that time they found themselves near to land, 27. On the *next day* they came to shore at Melita, 39. 44. They were entertained *three days* by Publius, xxviii. 7, and staid in the island *three months*, 11, which carried them through the winter; and in the spring of

A.D. 56.—They arrived at Rome, xxviii. 16, probably not long before Easter. Luke and Aristarchus were with St. Paul, xxvii. 2.

We shall now proceed to make some remarks upon this chronology, in which we shall notice the points in which we differ from other writers, and advance arguments for maintaining our own opinion.

According to the arrangement given above, St. Paul escaped from Damascus in the year 33, and we learn from 2 Cor. xi. 32, that it was the governor under Aretas who endeavoured to prevent his escape. Hug makes use of this circumstance to support his own opinion, that St. Paul fled from Damascus in 39. He concludes that Aretas held Damascus only from the middle of the first, till nearly the end of the second year of Claudius, which period he makes to agree with the years 38 and 39: hence he argues that St. Paul must have escaped from Damascus in one of

those years; he prefers the latter, and his translator informs us, that Schmidt has demonstrated that Aretas did not possess Damascus before the year 39. We have not seen this demonstration of Schmidt, but Hug himself tells us, that not long before the death of Tiberius we meet with an Aretas king of Petraë, who was at variance with the Romans, and Vitellius was carrying on war with him at the time of Tiberius' death. This latter event happened in March 37, and we cannot see why Aretas may not have had temporary possession of Damascus in 33. It is certain from Josephus, (*Antiq.* xviii. 5.) that hostilities broke out between Herod the Tetrarch and his father-in-law Aretas soon after the repudiation of Aretas' daughter by Herod, and the Arabian was powerful enough to put Herod's army to the rout; he was also at that time in possession of Machæruns, a fortress not far from Damascus. Vitellius was immediately commissioned to carry on the war; and, according to Hug himself, the war was not ended at the time of the death of Tiberius, so that it is quite certain that Aretas was at war with Rome in the year 33, when we have supposed him to have been in possession of Damascus. Some light might be thrown upon this question if we knew the exact meaning of St. Paul's words, *Acts*, xxvi. 11, when, speaking of Damascus, he says that he had persecuted the Christians "even unto strange cities," *ἕως καὶ εἰς τὰς ἕξω πόλεις*. Damascus was certainly not situated within the ancient limits of Judea; but if it had been subject to the Romans at the period here alluded to, St. Paul would hardly have used this expression. It was the opinion of Benson that the Romans never took away Damascus from the Arabians; but that Aretas held his dominion under them as a dependent tributary prince. This notion, though confirmed by the authority of Pocock, can hardly be reconciled with Josephus; but if it be admitted, the year of St. Paul's escape from Damascus becomes immaterial.

If we could learn the exact year, in which Claudius issued the decree for the departure of all Jews from Rome, *Acts*, xviii. 2, we should be able nearly to ascertain the date of St. Paul's first visit to Corinth. But though Suetonius notices such a decree, *Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Româ expulit*, (*Claud.* 25,) he does not tell us in what year it was issued; and Josephus is altogether silent upon the subject. We have, therefore, only to observe, that the fact, which is asserted by St. Luke, is confirmed by the profane historian; and since we have supposed St. Paul to have gone to Corinth in the year 46, there are nearly six years of the reign of Claudius previous to that visit, in which the decree may have been issued. Perhaps some support may be found for our opinion in the fact, that no mention of

this decree occurs in the *Annals* of Tacitus which have come down to us; and since the lost books of the *Annals* occupy the six first years of the reign of Claudius, it is probable that Tacitus mentioned the decree in one of those books; whereas, if St. Paul arrived at Corinth in 54, as Hug supposes, or in 50, as other chronologists have asserted, it is rather surprising that Tacitus should have omitted to notice a transaction, which evidently took place not long before St. Paul's arrival at Corinth. It is still more extraordinary to find Bertholdt, who supposed St. Paul to have arrived at Corinth in 53, supporting his hypothesis by a reference to this edict of Claudius; for the year 53 was the last of the reign of that emperor. We need not pay attention to the assertion of Orosius, who says, (vii. 6,) that the expulsion of the Jews took place in the ninth year of Claudius, and gives Josephus as his authority; at least the existing works of Josephus make no mention of any such a decree.

It is stated in Acts, xviii. 12, that Gallio was Proconsul of Achaia. We know from Tacitus, that Tiberius, in the year 15, released Achaia and Macedonia from what they considered the burthen of maintaining a proconsular government, and made them immediately dependent upon himself. Thus far the narrative of St. Luke might seem at variance with that of Tacitus. But we learn from Suetonius, that Claudius again placed these two provinces at the disposal of the senate, that is, he allowed them to be governed by a proconsul appointed by the senate, instead of by a prætor appointed by himself. Suetonius, as usual, does not mention the date of this change; but Brotier, who has supplied the lost books of Tacitus, assigns it to the year 44; and the chronological arrangement given above supposes St. Paul to have been brought before Gallio, Proconsul of Achaia, in 46.

Another reason for fixing an earlier date for St. Paul's going to Rome, than that which is affixed by Hug, may be drawn from what is said by the commanding officer at Jerusalem to St. Paul about the Egyptian, xxi. 38. Hug supposes St. Paul to have been apprehended at Jerusalem in 60: we have supposed it to take place in 53. In whatever year it happened, the affair of the Egyptian must have been a recent event, or the captain would scarcely have thought of it, nor would he have imagined Paul to have been the Egyptian rebel. Josephus, in two places, speaks of this Egyptian, *Antiq.* xx. 8, 6; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 13, 5; and each passage follows close upon his account of the beginning of Nero's reign. It might be said, that our own arrangement of dates is disproved by this very circumstance; for if the Egyptian raised his tumult in the beginning of Nero's reign, it could not have been spoken of by the captain who apprehended Paul in

the year 53, which was one year before Nero began to reign. But Josephus only says, that *about this time*, κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν καιρὸν, the Egyptian came to Jerusalem; an expression, which may easily be reconciled with the notion that the tumult was raised a short time before Nero's accession. If we are right in this conjecture, it is perfectly natural that the captain, who apprehended St. Paul in the summer of 53, should be in terror of a person who had raised a disturbance such a short time before; but if St. Paul was seized in 60, it is very strange that the captain should identify him with a man who had been totally defeated six or seven years before.

The ingenious remark of Michaelis will be known to many of our readers, in which he explains the words of St. Paul, Acts, xxiii. 5, "I wist not that he was the high-priest." Michaelis has quoted Josephus to prove, that Ananias the high-priest was sent prisoner to Rome in consequence of a dispute between the Jews and Samaritans. Josephus does not mention what reception Ananias met with at Rome: but Krebsius has shown it to be extremely probable, that he was acquitted of the charge, and returned to Jerusalem. In the mean time Jonathan had been raised to the office of high-priest, but was put to death some time after by Felix. Michaelis supposes that after his death Ananias, who had returned from Rome, "undertook of his own authority the discharge of the priesthood, and that St. Paul, who had been but a few days in Jerusalem, might have been ignorant that Ananias, who had been dispossessed of the priesthood, had taken upon himself a trust to which he was not entitled." The remark, as we said above, is extremely ingenious, if not perfectly satisfactory: and the dates, as far as we can ascertain them, agree exactly with the chronology given above. Josephus, as is usual with him, assigns no precise time to the imprisonment of Ananias; but immediately after he has mentioned his being sent to Rome, he proceeds to speak of the twelfth year of the reign of Claudius, which is the year 52; and since we have supposed St. Paul to have been apprehended at Jerusalem in 53, there is no difficulty, if we follow Michaelis, in conceiving St. Paul to have been ignorant who was high-priest in the year following the deposition of Ananias.

It is greatly to be regretted that Josephus, who more than once speaks of Felix being succeeded by Festus, does not inform us in what year it happened. If he had done so, there could no longer be any doubt as to the date of St. Paul's arrival at Rome. Hug says that Felix was recalled in the seventh year of Nero, A. D. 62. We have placed it in 55, the second year of Nero. Hug founds his opinion upon an expression of Josephus, who says, that in his twenty-sixth year he went to Rome; for "when Felix

was governor of Judea, he sent some priests of my acquaintance prisoners to Rome, upon a trifling and ordinary charge." (*Vita*, 3.) Josephus was born in the first year of Caligula, A. D. 37, and was in his twenty-sixth year in 62. Hence Hug assumes that Felix was recalled in 62. But Josephus expressly says that Felix had been recalled before this journey to Rome, καὶ δὲ χρόνον Φήλιξ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπετρόπευσεν κ. τ. λ. It is plain from these words, that Felix was not governor when Josephus went to Rome: what time had elapsed since his recall, we cannot learn from the words just quoted. If we may argue from the case of St. Paul, a prisoner who was sent to Rome, to appear before the emperor, was liable to be detained there some years; and if Felix sent these priests to Rome in the year 55, though seven years may be a long period for their continuing in confinement, we cannot say that the fact is impossible. Petavius may here be quoted upon our side, who saw the necessity of making this supposition, though his calculations led him to differ in the number of years: his words are, that "the Jews, who were sent to Rome by Felix five years before, were at length released from confinement through the interest of Josephus." It may be observed, however, that the passage in which Josephus speaks of Felix being succeeded by Festus, occurs in the same chapter which records the accession of Nero; and the last date which had been mentioned, is the first year of Nero's reign. It would certainly appear from the narrative of Josephus, that Festus succeeded Felix soon after Nero's accession; and there are other passages in Josephus which prove, almost to demonstration, that Hug must be wrong in placing the recall of Felix in the seventh year of Nero. Josephus states that the Jewish war broke out in the twelfth year of Nero, (*Antiq.* xx. 11, 1;) and in another place he tells us, that four years before the commencement of the war, Albinus was governor of Judea: this was the eighth year of Nero. Now, if we suppose with Hug, that the recall of Felix took place in the seventh year of Nero, there is scarcely any time left for the government of Festus, who succeeded Felix, since we know from Josephus that Albinus, who succeeded Festus, was in office in the eighth of Nero. Again, Josephus informs us that, as soon as Felix was recalled, some of the principal Jews in Cæsarea went to Rome to accuse him to the emperor, and that he would certainly have been punished if Nero had not listened to the repeated solicitations of Pallas, the brother of Felix, who was at that time very high in favour. Now we know from Tacitus, that the ascendancy of Pallas was at its height in the reign of Claudius; and, though he continued to have influence in the following reign, the sunshine did not last long; for Nero removed him from the management of affairs (*demovet curâ rerum*) in the year 55, (*Annal.* xiii. 14.) He was publicly

accused in the same year (23), and put to death in 62 (xiv. 65.) It appears, therefore, that in the very year in which Hug says that Felix was recalled, Pallas was put to death; and yet Josephus says, that Felix was saved from punishment by the intercession of Pallas, who at that time had great influence at court! It is impossible to suppose Josephus to have made so gross a mistake in an affair which happened in his own day, and in which his countrymen were so much interested; consequently, since it is impossible that Pallas could have interceded for Felix in the year 62, the recall of Felix must have been before that time; but we have also seen, that Pallas had no influence with Nero after the year 55, which is the very year in which we have supposed that Felix was recalled: so that instead of placing this event too early, we have put it at the latest possible date which the histories of Josephus and Tacitus will allow, and the pardon of Felix must have been one of the last instances of favour and compliance shown by Nero to Pallas.

It is singular that the same passage in Josephus should supply us with another argument for questioning the chronology of Hug. The historian tells us, that the Jews from Cæsarea, who came to accuse Felix, bribed Burrus, who was Greek secretary to Nero, to cause the Jews in Cæsarea to be deprived of the rights of citizenship. The fortunes of Pallas and Burrus, though no two persons could be more opposite in character, afford a remarkable parallel. Both of them were high in favour at the beginning of Nero's reign. In 55, Pallas was removed from the management of affairs, and Burrus only escaped disgrace through the interest of Seneca. In 62, Pallas was put to death, and Burrus died. But according to Hug it was in 62 that the deputies from Cæsarea bribed Burrus, which we have seen to be chronologically impossible. The time when Burrus was most likely to have had influence was in the two first years of Nero's reign, and it is exactly at that period that we suppose Felix to have been recalled.

We cannot help observing an oversight of Townsend, (vol. ii. p. 588,) who quotes Josephus as saying, that Pallas, even in the sixth year of Nero, obtained the pardon of his brother. He no doubt alluded to the passage in Josephus now before us; but he forgot that Josephus assigned no particular date to the transaction, and in placing it in the sixth year of Nero he assumed the very point at issue. He would endeavour to make out that, "though Pallas was no longer a favourite, his influence with Nero had not entirely declined at the Roman court." But this remnant of court influence does not at all meet the words of Josephus, who expressly says that Nero showed particular favour at that time, *μάλιστα δὲ τότε διὰ τιμῆς ἔχων ἐκεῖνον.*

It is stated by Benson, that Nero, in the former part of his reign, added somewhat to the dominions of Felix; which might appear to contradict our notion of his having recalled Felix in the second year of his reign. Benson refers us to Josephus, *Antiq.* xx. 8. 4. and *Bel. Jud.* ii. 13. 2. But in the former of these places Felix is not named; and from the latter, it would appear that his dominions, instead of being increased, were diminished;—and so the passage is understood by Pearson. Beside which, Josephus expressly says that the transaction happened in the *first* year of Nero's reign.

Many commentators, among whom we may reckon Grotius and Michaelis, have supposed the Narcissus, mentioned in *Rom.* xvi. 11. to have been the celebrated freedman of Claudius. We know from Tacitus, (*Annal.* xiii. 1.) that he was put to death at the beginning of Nero's reign. The Epistle to the Romans, according to our chronology, was written A. D. 53, and Nero began his reign in the October of the year following; so that when St. Paul said, "Greet them that be of the household of Narcissus," τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου, the dates allow us to suppose that he meant the freedman of Claudius. But if the Epistle was written in the years 58 or 60, as many critics have supposed, this is impossible; and yet these critics, regardless of the palpable anachronism, have conceived the celebrated Narcissus to be intended. Michaelis expressly names the year 58 as the date of the Epistle, and yet says that "Narcissus is perhaps the same person as the freedman of Claudius!" Macknight seems to have been aware of the impossibility; and observes, that the salutation is not sent to Narcissus, but *to those of his family*, which may have subsisted after his death; an hypothesis which is likely to obtain few followers. We give no opinion as to the identity of Narcissus; but if St. Paul intended the freedman of Claudius, our own chronology must be adopted.

We shall have occasion to show, presently, that the notion of St. Paul going to Rome in 56, and being released in 58, removes many difficulties in settling the date of his subsequent travels and his martyrdom.

We are aware that, in fixing the year 56 as the date of St. Paul's arrival in Rome, we differ from the majority of chronologists. But if the question is to be decided by authority, we are afraid that every one of our opponents will be in the same predicament with ourselves. Thus, though Pearson, Tillemont, Tomline and Townsend, agree in saying that St. Paul arrived at Rome in 61, Usher and Hug place his arrival in 63. What system of chronology then are we to follow? If we agree with the former, we must differ from the latter. Petavius and Capellus have come to

the same conclusion with ourselves; and when so much uncertainty prevails, there can at least be no presumption in following where others have led the way.

In forming our own opinion as to the date of this event, we adopted a scheme which we would recommend to all persons who study the Acts of the Apostles. We first extracted from that book every passage which had any connection with the order of events; and upon examination we found, what we stated above, that the only date which can be settled beyond all contradiction, is the death of Herod Agrippa, xii. 19, &c. When we say this, we mean that it is the only event, the date of which can be settled by the positive authority of an historian, without calling in the aid of argument and inference. Herod Agrippa unquestionably died in 44; and hence we learn the time of St. Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, xi. 30. Having ascertained this point, we followed the narrative of St. Luke, and arranged each event in its proper order of time, according to the notices which occur in the sacred historian. When we had finished our chronological scheme in this manner, we found it to be necessary, for the truth of it, that Festus should have succeeded Felix in 55. We then looked to chronologists, and found almost all of them against us. We looked to Josephus, the only historian who has mentioned the transaction, and we found him decidedly in our favour. If we have argued rightly from what Josephus says of Pallas obtaining the pardon of Felix, the latter must have been recalled in 55; and in this year we had concluded *à priori* that his recall took place. We do not mean to attach much credit to the ancient Greek preface to St. Paul's Epistles, which was published by R. Stephens, and after him by Bœcler (Crit. Sac. tom. vii. p. 571), but it at least shows that this notion is not a modern one, since it expressly says that St. Paul was apprehended in Jerusalem in the 13th year of Claudius, *i. e.* A.D. 53, and that Festus succeeded Felix two years after that event. Again, we found it to be essential to our plan that St. Paul's first arrival at Rome should be placed in 56, the second year of Nero's reign. Here, again, chronologists were against us,—they brought the Apostle to Rome in 61 or 63. Petavius is the ablest ally to whom we can appeal as supporting our own opinion; he could not resist the evidence of Felix having been recalled in the second year of Nero: and beside Capellus, who also brought St. Paul to Rome in 56, and Cave in 57, the same notion has lately been maintained by Bishop Burgess, and by a writer in the Classical Journal, No. 19. We have a great respect for all modern chronologists, including, of course, ourselves; but we cannot refuse to the ancients some voice in settling these questions. Now

there can be no doubt that in ancient times it was always conceived that St. Paul came to Rome in the second year of Nero. Eusebius puts it so in his *Chronicle*; and Jerom might be thought to have written on purpose to support our theory, when he said that St. Paul came to Rome "in the 25th year after the crucifixion, that is, in the second year of Nero, at the time when Festus succeeded Felix as Procurator of Judæa."

With this evidence on our side, we venture to say that the dates of the second visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem, and of his first arrival in Rome, may be considered as settled points. He went to Jerusalem with contributions in 44; he came prisoner to Rome in 56. In settling the detail of intermediate events, chronologists may be allowed to differ. Thus, it is possible that Paul and Barnabas set out on their first apostolic tour in the year 44, after returning from Jerusalem; and in that case we would not quarrel with a person who supposed that first tour to extend over part of two years. Our own opinion is, however, decided, that it did not occupy more than part of one year. So, also, it is possible that Paul and Barnabas staid more than a year in Antioch, after their return from their first journey, and that they set out upon the second in 47, instead of 46. In this case we must shorten St. Paul's residence in Ephesus, which we have supposed to have occupied the years 49, 50, and 51. St. Paul's expression of "three years," (Acts, xx. 31,) may mean three years more or less; and his words will easily admit of either interpretation. The point, which we cannot dispense with, is, that St. Paul was imprisoned at Cæsarea in 53; from this period the dates explain themselves; he was left in confinement two years; and in 56, we conclude, with Eusebius and Jerom, that he arrived in Rome.

If the accuracy of these two dates be allowed, it follows that we are also right in our other hypothesis, that St. Paul's first journey only occupied one year; at least it could not occupy three years, as Pearson, Tillemont, Benson, Tomline, Townsend and others, have imagined. The majority of chronologists suppose the Council at Jerusalem to have been held in 49,—Hug even places it so late as 53; but if St. Paul arrived at Rome in 56, and had passed the two preceding years at prison in Cæsarea, we cannot suppose the Council to have been held so late even as 49. Subsequently to that event, St. Paul took his second journey; passed eighteen months at Corinth; made a third apostolic tour; spent three years at Ephesus; travelled a fourth time, and arrived in the following year at Jerusalem, where he was apprehended, and kept in prison for two years. It is impossible to crowd all these events into the space between 49 and 56. But if we sup-

pose the first apostolic journey to have occupied only one year, and to have been completed in 45, St. Luke's narrative naturally leads us to suppose that the Council was held in the year following; and the period between 46 and 56 is quite of sufficient length to admit of all the transactions enumerated above.

We are aware, also, that in placing the conversion of St. Paul in 31, we differ from many chronologists. We have already stated the process by which we arrived at this date: we counted back fourteen years from his third visit to Jerusalem in 46, and that brought us to 33, the time of his going to Jerusalem for the first time after his conversion (Gal. ii. 1); we then counted back three years more, and this brought us to 31, the date of his conversion (Gal. i. 18). If we look to the opinions of other writers, we find Petavius placing it in 33; Tillemont in 34; Pearson, Usher, Benson, Tomline and Townsend, in 35, and Capellus in 38. It would be vain to attempt to follow authority in this case; we might, perhaps, wish to do so, but we are perplexed with the multiplicity of opinions. Here again we would look to ancient writers; and we find Jerom decidedly on our side. He says, as quoted above, that St. Paul came to Rome in the second year of Nero, or the 25th after the crucifixion. Nero began his reign in October, 54; and as St. Paul certainly came to Rome in the spring, Jerom must have intended the year 56 as the date of his arrival. If this was the 25th year after the crucifixion, that event happened in the year 31 of our era. We have no hesitation in saying, that Jerom considered the conversion of St. Paul to have happened in the same year with the crucifixion of our Lord. If he did not, he could not have followed St. Paul's own assertion, who tells us that the third year after his conversion preceded by fourteen years his third journey to Jerusalem. But Jerom, who believed St. Paul to have come to Rome in 56, cannot have placed this third journey later than 46, because the events recorded by St. Luke require, at least, that interval of time; consequently, if he followed St. Paul's own words, he must have supposed, with us, that his conversion happened $14 + 3$ years previous to the year 46; or, in other words, he believed St. Paul to have been converted in 31. It may be said, that if we count back seventeen years from the year 46, it brings us to the year 30, not 31; in which case Jerom would have placed the conversion of St. Paul before the crucifixion of our Lord. But Jerom evidently supposed the two periods, of fourteen and three years, to be each reckoned inclusively; for he calls the second year of Nero the twenty-fifth from the crucifixion, which calculation obliges us to fix the crucifixion in the year 31; and if we reckon the two periods of fourteen and three

years inclusively, we also bring the conversion of St. Paul to the same year—31, but we cannot bring it later.

To many of our readers it may perhaps appear extraordinary, that we should speak of St. Paul being converted within so very short a time after the Ascension. But we would again ask any person to take up the New Testament and read the first nine chapters of the Acts without prejudice and without a commentary. The Pentecost, which followed the Ascension, is a fixed and settled date : from this period, to the apprehension of Stephen, there is nothing in the sacred narrative to mark the order of time. The lapse of some days is implied in ii. 46 ; and the expressions used in iv. 32, 33, v. 16. 42, would seem to denote that the Gospel had made a considerable progress. But still there is nothing extravagant in the notion that the death of Stephen took place in the same year in which our Lord ascended ; and, if we pursue the narrative, there is great reason for supposing that the conversion of St. Paul took place shortly after. It might be thought at first that the persecution mentioned in viii. 1, which followed the death of Stephen, was intended by St. Luke to occupy a considerable time ; but it evidently took place, or at least it began, immediately after his death, since the funeral of Stephen is mentioned in the verse which *follows* the account of the persecution. In the next verse Saul is described as committing great injuries against the Christians ; after which the remainder of the chapter is taken up with what happened in Samaria ; and then, in the beginning of the ninth chapter, the narrative again returns to Saul, as if all that had been said since the last mention of him was to be read in a parenthesis, or rather as if St. Luke intended to describe two contemporary series of events ; and, while Philip the Deacon, and Peter and John were employed in Samaria, Saul was carrying on his persecution in other parts, and at length went to Damascus. It might even be inferred that the conversion of Cornelius, and all that is related of St. Peter in Acts, ix. 32,—xi. 18, took place but a short time after the conversion of St. Paul ; for, in v. 19, the narrative returns to an account of those persons who had quitted Jerusalem upon the death of Stephen, so that xi. 19 is a kind of continuation of viii. 1. If this be admitted, the conversion of Saul cannot have happened very long after the death of Stephen, and, if authority is anything in this case, we may quote many writers as supposing that Stephen was martyred within a short time after our Lord's ascension. We may again appeal to the ancient Greek preface to St. Paul's Epistles, which was published by Stephens, and which expressly says that the seven deacons were appointed *some few days after* the Ascension, that soon after (μετ' ἐπιτα) Stephen was killed ; and,

a short time after (μικρὸν ὕστερον), St. Paul went to Damascus. These events, it says, nearly occupied the whole year. Baronius, Petavius, Tillemont and Cave, have supported this opinion; and though we have said that other chronologists have assigned such very different dates to the conversion of St. Paul, the difference rather consists in their giving different dates to the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, for most of them place the death of Stephen soon after that event, and the conversion of St. Paul soon after the death of Stephen. If, therefore, Jerom supposed that our Lord suffered in 31, and that St. Paul was converted in the same year, the notion is by no means so untenable as it might at first be thought. We should conceive that this was also the notion of a much earlier writer than Jerom, we mean Clement of Alexandria, who speaks of Paul being in the prime of life *immediately after* the ascension of our Lord, εὐθέως μετὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου ἀνάληψιν ἀκμάσας (Strom. iv. p. 625). Clement probably alluded to the words of St. Luke (Acts, vii. 58), who calls St. Paul a young man, νεανίου, at the time of Stephen's martyrdom; and the passage quoted above seems to show that Clement believed the death of Stephen to have followed soon after the ascension of our Lord.

It may be objected to the scheme of chronology here proposed, that it requires us to believe that a space of only a few weeks, or at most a few months, is described in the nine first chapters of the Acts, as far as ix. 19; whereas in about two chapters, *i. e.* from ix. 20 to xi. 25, a period of twelve years must have elapsed. This is certainly true: but we do not feel bound to assign a reason why St. Luke should make the events of a few months occupy nine chapters, and yet compress the events of twelve years into two chapters. Whatever date is assigned to the conversion of St. Paul, these two chapters must equally contain the events of twelve years; and if we suppose his conversion to have followed soon after the ascension of Christ, we may perhaps find a reason why St. Luke should devote so many chapters to the incidents of so short a period. It is highly probable that he was himself at Jerusalem at the time of the crucifixion, and that he remained there after that event; consequently he saw and heard everything which he related, and hence the minuteness with which he writes. We would mention Acts, ii. 9. 11. 41; iii. 3. 8; iv. 4. 22; v. 7; vi. 9, as instances of this particularity, which seem to show that he must have been an eye-witness of what he relates; and we should also think that he must have heard the speeches which he reports so much in detail. In the persecution which followed the death of Stephen, he was probably forced, like the rest, to quit Jerusalem, Acts, viii. 1. It is after this period that he ceases to be so diffuse, with the exception of relating the conversions of St. Paul

and Cornelius. The former he of course received from St. Paul himself, and the importance of the latter required him to inform himself about it. When he resumes his narrative in xi. 19, we find him mentioning the progress of the Gospel in Antioch; and if Eusebius and Jerom are correct in saying that St. Luke was a native of Antioch, we may suppose that he went from Jerusalem to his native city, and, being engaged there, he was no longer able to use the same minuteness in relating what took place in Judæa. Dr. Wait informs us that Süskind has recently defended the opinion of St. Paul having been converted in the same year as Christ's ascension.

There is indeed a way of removing all difficulty, which has been adopted by many writers; and, though we cannot follow their example, we cannot say that it is demonstrably opposed to the expressions of St. Paul. We have often alluded to the Apostle's words in Gal. ii. 1: "Then after fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem," &c. We have all along supposed these fourteen years to be dated from his first visit to Jerusalem, mentioned Gal. i. 18; but some writers have reckoned them from his conversion, supposing St. Paul to have kept that event in view as the great and leading epoch, from which all the future circumstances of his life were to be dated. Upon this hypothesis, the fourteen years which we have reckoned back from the year 46, and which bring us to the year 33, will mark, not St. Paul's first visit to Jerusalem after his sojourn in Arabia, but his conversion. There would then appear nothing extraordinary, even upon Jerom's idea of the crucifixion happening in 31, that the conversion of St. Paul happened two years after, in 33; but after a repeated perusal of St. Paul's words in his Epistle to the Galatians, we can come to no other conclusion but that the fourteen years are to be reckoned from his first visit to Jerusalem. Having mentioned his conversion in Gal. i. 16, his sojourn in Arabia, and return to Damascus, 17, he goes on to say, "Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem;" the six following verses are taken up with an account of what he did at Jerusalem; and in ii. 1 he continues, "Then fourteen years after I went up *again* to Jerusalem." St. Paul is evidently relating these events in the order of time; there is not the slightest reason for supposing that he reverted in his mind to the period of his conversion: on the contrary, he first mentions a period of three years, and then another of fourteen, which seems clearly to show that they are consecutive periods; and the word *again* in ii. 1, almost compels us to refer back to the date of the first journey mentioned in i. 18. Upon the whole we cannot depart from our original notion that the fourteen years are to be dated, not from the conversion of St. Paul, but from three years

after that event: and in this we are following the great majority of chronologists. We may add, that though this doubt, as to the interpretation of Gal. ii. 1, may make a difference of three years in the date which we assign to the conversion of St. Paul, this is the only event which is affected by it. It does not in the slightest degree affect what we may consider the cardinal points of our chronology, the third journey of St. Paul to Jerusalem in 46, and his arrival at Rome in 56.

We need scarcely notice the theory of Capellus, who would date the fourteen years mentioned in Gal. ii. 1, not from the conversion of St. Paul, or his first journey to Jerusalem, but from the crucifixion; but being aware that it is impossible to reconcile such an interpretation with the words of St. Paul, he proposed to read *τεσσαρων* instead of *δεκατεσσαρων*, and so to date the Council at Jerusalem only four years after St. Paul's first visit. Such an alteration of the text is as inadmissible as his interpretation of the words which we now read, and to mention such a proposition is to refute it.

We will now proceed to consider the probable dates of St. Paul's Epistles.

1 Thessalonians, A.D. 46.—If we compare this Epistle with the account of St. Paul's residence in Thessalonica, Acts, xvii. 1. 10, the date of it may easily be settled. Few persons, indeed, have held any doubt upon the subject. Some have supposed it to have been written from Athens; and so it is stated in the spurious subscription, as well as in the *Synopsis Scripturæ*, falsely ascribed to Athanasius (vol. ii. p. 196). Whiston stands alone in contending that the two Epistles to the Thessalonians were written but a short time before St. Paul's death: an hypothesis which it is needless to confute. Grotius conceived that what is called the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians was really written first; but he advances no valid reason for this conjecture, and agrees in thinking that 1 Thessalonians was written from Corinth.

This has been the opinion of almost every commentator, and the internal evidence of the Epistle makes it certain. St. Paul was at Thessalonica A.D. 46 (Acts, xvii. 1. 10). From thence he went to Beræa and to Athens, leaving Silas and Timothy at Beræa, with orders to join him as soon as they could. St. Luke says that Silas and Timothy joined St. Paul at Corinth, Acts, xviii. 5; and in the Epistle, St. Paul says that Timothy was just come to him, iii. 6. The Epistle was, therefore, written soon after the arrival of Silas and Timothy at Corinth, and the names of both of them are joined with that of St. Paul in the salutation. From an expression in 1 Thess. iii. 2, Benson, Michaelis, Bertholdt, and others, have inferred that Silas and Timothy, or at

least Timothy, joined St. Paul at Athens; that St. Paul sent back Timothy to Thessalonica; and that the arrival of Timothy and Silas at Corinth, which is mentioned in Acts, xviii. 5, was the second time of their coming to St. Paul. Townsend agrees in this notion, and states erroneously, that St. Paul gave orders to his two companions to join him *at Athens*. This is not stated by St. Luke, who only says, that St. Paul told Timothy and Silas to follow him as soon as they could. St. Paul certainly says in 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2, "I resolved to remain in Athens alone, and sent Timothy to confirm and exhort you." The true state of the case seems to be this: the abrupt and precipitate manner in which St. Paul was obliged to leave Thessalonica, naturally made him uneasy for the state of his converts there, and more than once during his journey to Athens he had serious thoughts of turning back and visiting them, 1 Thess. ii. 18. So strongly were these fears impressed upon him, that, when he reached Athens, he gave up the idea of shortly being joined there by Silas and Timothy, according to the directions which he had given them at Berea, and making up his mind to stay there by himself, (iii. 1,) he sent word to Timothy to go to Thessalonica to confirm and exhort the Christians there. Whether Timothy was accompanied by Silas to Thessalonica is not stated, but most probably he went alone, as St. Paul speaks only of having sent Timothy, (iii. 2,) and again, in v. 6, he speaks only of Timothy having come to him. But since St. Luke in the Acts speaks of St. Paul being joined at Corinth by Silas and Timothy, the probability is, that Silas went first, and Timothy followed some time after; and St. Luke meant to speak of the time when both of them were arrived. Rosenmüller and Hug both agree in thinking that Timothy did not make two journeys to rejoin St. Paul; and the narrative of St. Luke in the Acts seems to admit of no other hypothesis.

Michaelis accounts for the apparent discrepancy between St. Paul and St. Luke by observing, that St. Luke was not present with St. Paul at Athens, having staid behind at Philippi. But he forgot that Philippi was at no great distance from Thessalonica, and that, if St. Luke had been staying there, he could hardly have been ignorant of Timothy having returned from Athens with a message from St. Paul. His silence as to this circumstance appears to us conclusive, that no such journey was ever undertaken by Timothy; nor is there any real discrepancy between the two writers.

Commentators have been divided as to the period of St. Paul's residence at Corinth, in which we are to suppose this Epistle to have been written. Benson and Michaelis refer it to the latter part of his sojourn there; but Hug prefers ascribing it to an

earlier period : and from the words of St. Paul in iii. 6, “ But Timothy having *just now* come to me,” the latter opinion seems unquestionably the true one. We conclude, therefore, that the Epistle was written in the winter of 46, shortly after St. Paul had received the account, which Timothy brought him, of the state of the converts in Thessalonica.

2 Thessalonians, A.D. 47.—The spurious subscription to this Epistle dates it from Athens like the former one. The *Synopsis Scripturæ* (Athanas. vol. ii. p. 197) dates it from Rome, which is singular, because it dated the first from Athens, and proves that this Synopsis, and the spurious subscriptions do not always agree, as might be shown in many instances: and the Synopsis appears to have been drawn up by some person who was neither ignorant nor careless upon the subject.

Whiston is the only modern writer who has supposed this second Epistle, like the former, to have been written from Rome about fifteen years after St. Paul’s residence in Corinth. The theory of Grotius is still more absurd, that it was written about five years after St. Paul’s conversion: though the name of Timothy is joined in the salutation, and he is known not to have accompanied St. Paul till about eight years after the date which Grotius assigns to this Epistle ! We have already mentioned the notion of Grotius, that this was really the first Epistle; but there are three passages, in what is called the Second Epistle, in which he might be thought to allude to one which had been written before, ii. 2. 15; iii. 17. The two latter instances are perhaps not so plain; but, in ii. 2, he appears clearly to allude to the passage in his First Epistle, iv. 13; v. 1. 3; nor can we at all accede to the opinion of Hug, who asserts, without any appearance of doubt, that, in the second verse of the second chapter, St. Paul meant to speak of a spurious epistle, which had been sent to Thessalonica in his name.

Almost all the commentators are agreed, that this Epistle was written from Corinth at no great distance of time from the first: Benson thinks within a few months; and when St. Paul says, in i. 4, that he boasted of the Thessalonians in the *churches* of God, we must suppose that he had been preaching for some time in Corinth, and that the Gospel had made considerable progress, or he would not have used such an expression. We conclude, therefore, that the second Epistle to the Thessalonians was written sometime in the year 47.

Titus, A.D. 51.—There are few of St. Paul’s Epistles, the date of which has been so much contested, as that to Titus. We will mention the different opinions which have been held upon this subject in the order of time.

Michaelis supposed it to have been written during the eighteen months which St. Paul is said to have passed at Corinth, Acts, xviii. 11; in which he is followed by Hales and Townsend.

Hug thinks that it was written from Ephesus, when St. Paul stopped there on his way from Corinth, Acts, xviii. 19.

Heinrichs conjectured it to have been written after St. Paul had left Corinth, and while he was at Troas, Acts, xx. 6.

Lardner fixes the date at some time between St. Paul leaving Ephesus, Acts, xx. 1, and arriving at Jerusalem, xxi. 15, in which opinion Barrington agrees with him.

Grotius supposed it to be written from Rome, or some other place in Italy, between St. Paul's first and second imprisonment there; and Pearson, Whitby, Paley and Bertholdt, agree with Grotius as to the time.

These are the different opinions which have been entertained concerning the date of the Epistle to Titus. With respect to the first of them, which has been defended at much length by Michaelis, and after him by Townsend; there are many reasons which make it impossible for us to entertain it. In the first place, the words of St. Luke are very express, that St. Paul actually passed eighteen months at Corinth, Acts, xviii. 11; and the term which he makes use of, ἐκάλισε, seems specially to preclude the notion that during this period St. Paul made the voyage to Crete, from which he had just returned when he wrote this Epistle. The sense which St. Luke attached to the verb κατέλειπε may be seen in xxiv. 49, of his Gospel. Michaelis replies, that St. Luke certainly omitted some circumstances in the life of St. Paul, as for instance, the shipwrecks noticed in 2 Cor. xi. 25, and some of the other sufferings which he mentions in that place. This we cannot deny. He adds, that St. Luke had quitted St. Paul at Philippi (in 46), and did not rejoin him till he came again to Philippi (in 53); consequently he may have been ignorant of many things which befell St. Paul during his residence at Corinth. This kind of argument is always particularly attractive to a German; but on the present occasion, St. Luke's own words show that he was minutely acquainted with the movements of St. Paul. Nor would the period of eighteen months allow of this voyage to Crete. Michaelis himself supposes that the first and second Epistles to the Thessalonians were written from Corinth, which, at the very least, would require two or three out of the eighteen months to have been actually passed in that city: nor would the Apostle have made a voyage at all during winter. He must, therefore, have gone to Crete in the spring or summer of 47; but it appears from the Epistle, that he intended to pass the winter of that year at Nicopolis, iii. 12; and Michaelis supposes that he did pass it

there. So that in fact a very small portion of the eighteen months would remain to have been spent in Corinth; a supposition which the most Germanized interpretation of St. Luke's words would never allow us to make. Michaelis agreed with Grotius in thinking that St. Luke intended Nicopolis in Epirus; and, being aware that this city did not lie quite in the way from Crete to Corinth, he observes that St. Paul may have been driven thither in a storm, and perhaps, at this very time, he suffered one of the three shipwrecks. This convenient solution is repeated by Townsend; but both of them forgot that St. Paul speaks in this Epistle of intending beforehand to winter in Nicopolis: it was a plan which he had formed deliberately, and at his leisure; so that Michaelis is reduced to this dilemma: he must suppose St. Paul either to have intended to be shipwrecked, or to have formed the deliberate project of taking Nicopolis in Epirus on his way from Crete to Corinth.

There is, however, another argument furnished by the Epistle itself, which entirely precludes the idea of its having been written during these eighteen months. Apollos was with Titus at this time in Crete, iii. 13. Now it is quite evident from the Acts, that Apollos did not go to Ephesus till after these eighteen months were expired, and St. Paul had sailed for Asia, xviii. 21—28. It is also plain, from the 25th verse, that Apollos was only acquainted with John's baptism when he reached Ephesus; so that he could not have been assisting Titus in Crete before this time; nor is it probable that St. Paul had ever heard of him. Michaelis makes the extraordinary assertion, that Apollos probably came to Corinth before St. Paul left it, in which notion he is echoed by Townsend. But St. Luke, in the Acts, says exactly the contrary. He first mentions St. Paul's departure from Corinth, xviii. 18, his sailing to Ephesus, 19, and his journey to Jerusalem, where he arrived at Pentecost, 21-22. He then passed *some time* at Antioch, and commenced another journey through Galatia and Phrygia, 23. After this St. Luke proceeds to mention the arrival of Apollos at Ephesus, 24; and though he does not say in so many words that St. Paul was not there, it is quite demonstrable that he was not. He tells us, in v. 19, that St. Paul staid a very short time at Ephesus, and left Aquila and Priscilla there: in v. 26, we learn that Aquila and Priscilla met with Apollos, and instructed him more perfectly in the Gospel; which passage very clearly shows that St. Paul was not there, or Apollos would have been instructed by him rather than by Aquila. Our readers are perhaps satisfied that Apollos did not arrive in Corinth before St. Paul left it; but St. Luke expressly tells us, that while Apollos was in Corinth, (whither he went from Ephesus, 27,) Paul had made his journey

through Galatia and Phrygia, (compare xviii. 23,) and was arrived at Ephesus. We have thus the express words of St. Luke, that St. Paul left Corinth before Pentecost, and that Apollos arrived there some time after; and yet Michaelis and Townsend contend that Apollos arrived there before St. Paul left it. This hypothesis was indeed necessary for the date which they assigned to the Epistle; and since St. Luke's words demonstrate the contrary to be the fact, we conclude that Apollos could not have been assisting Titus in Crete in the year 47, and consequently the Epistle of St. Paul to Titus could not have been written in that year.

The next opinion to be examined is that of Hug, who says, that "Paul went from Corinth to Ephesus, where he resided some weeks, and composed this instruction for Titus," p. 354. It appears from what follows, that Hug alluded to the time when St. Paul is said to have stopped at Ephesus on his way from Corinth to Jerusalem, xviii. 19. He chooses to say, that St. Paul resided there *some weeks*, which he certainly did not, being then in a great hurry to reach Jerusalem by Pentecost, 20, 21. He probably did not stop there above a day or two. Still more improbable is it, that in his way from Corinth to Ephesus he stopped at Crete, which is what Hug supposes. His stay in that island, whenever it took place, was certainly not a very short one, since he founded churches there, and placed Titus over them. Hug, indeed, argues in favour of this voyage to Crete by observing, that St. Paul is said to have *sailed for Syria, and landed at Ephesus*; upon which he asks, "What was the cause of Paul, who had embarked for Syria, coming instead to Ephesus?" He seems to think that St. Luke's words warrant the notion of St. Paul having made a digression in his route. But the answer to his question is obvious. St. Paul set sail, meaning to reach Syria, and the vessel made straight across the Ægean for Ephesus, that being the usual course in the coasting voyages of those days. Again, he tells Titus in this Epistle that he intended to winter at Nicopolis, iii. 12; but St. Luke represents him as telling the Ephesians that, though he could not stay longer at that time, he would return back to them; and we see what was his meaning in that promise, when we find that he returned back that very year, and passed the winter at Ephesus. Hug also supposes, that when St. Paul arrived at Ephesus, Apollos was there; and that he wrote to Titus to send Apollos on his journey, because the latter was about to touch at Crete on his way to Corinth. Hug argues completely in a circle: he thinks it not improbable that St. Paul touched at Crete on his way from Corinth to Ephesus, because Apollos touched there on his way from Ephesus to Corinth; but Hug had no grounds for making this assertion with respect to Apollos, except on the sup-

position that the Epistle to Titus was written at this time. We have, however, proved from St. Luke's own words that St. Paul and Apollos did not meet at Ephesus, which at once overturns Hug's theory.

Heinrichs, who dated the Epistle from Troas, when St. Paul arrived there from Corinth, Acts, xx. 6, conceived the Apostle to have made his voyage to Crete during the three months which he passed in Greece, Acts, xx. 2, 3; and that, when he reached Troas, he had abandoned his intention of going to Jerusalem, and wrote to Titus to meet him at Nicopolis ad Nessum. But, beside the improbability of St. Paul having selected the winter months for a voyage to Crete, we can prove that before he left Ephesus he had fully fixed to go to Jerusalem, 1 Cor. xvi. 4; and while he was in Corinth he expressed the same determination, Rom. xv. 25; so that when we consider the object of his journey, which was to carry the contributions which he had collected for the Christians of Judæa, it is impossible to suppose that he so soon abandoned his design. That he did not pass the winter of this year at Nicopolis is a matter of absolute certainty.

Lardner supposes the Epistle to have been written some time between St. Paul's departure from Ephesus in 52, and his arrival at Jerusalem in 53, and endeavours to show that the transactions of St. Paul between these two events occupied a longer space of time than what is commonly assigned to them, probably about two years. The notions of Michaelis and Hug can be demonstrated to be untrue, which certainly cannot be said of this of Lardner. We have supposed St. Paul to leave Ephesus in 52, and it appears from Acts, xx. 1—3, that he went from thence through Macedonia into Greece, where he staid three months. St. Luke does not specify any place in Greece, but we shall prove presently that he was at Corinth; and it appears plain, that he passed the winter in Greece, and set out for Macedonia in the following spring. Thus St. Luke's words would not preclude the notion of St. Paul having visited Crete during these three months; but the probability is against it, when we consider that they were the winter months, in which the Apostle would scarcely have undertaken a voyage to Crete. Lardner, however, by extending the time between St. Paul's departure from Ephesus and his arrival at Jerusalem, makes this difficulty somewhat less.

We come now to the notion adopted by Grotius and others, that the Epistle was written in the interval between St. Paul's first and second imprisonment at Rome. Michaelis endeavours to refute this notion by showing that the interval between St. Paul's imprisonment in 65, and his death in 66, is too short for this voyage to Crete to have taken place. But if St. Paul arrived

at Rome in 56, and consequently was released in 58, as we have supposed, this argument is reduced to nothing. The same may be said of Lardner's objection, that St. Paul was too old after his release from imprisonment to undertake any new work; for if St. Paul was a young man at the time of the death of Stephen, Acts, vii. 58, perhaps twenty-one years of age, he was not fifty when he was released from prison in 58. Still, however, we cannot adopt the hypothesis of this late date for the Epistle to Titus, and we will now proceed to deliver our own opinion.

We conceive that it was written during that residence of St. Paul in Ephesus, which is mentioned Acts, xix. 1. 8. 10. 22. From the three last places it would appear that St. Paul passed somewhat more than two years and three months at Ephesus; but in xx. 31, he speaks of having been there three years. We may suppose that St. Paul actually used the words *three years*, for St. Luke was present, (see v. 5,) and probably heard them. Now since in the nineteenth chapter he only accounts for somewhat more than two years and three months of this period, it might fairly be assumed, that St. Paul used the expression *three years*, without intending to be taken literally; having passed the whole of the year 50, and parts of the years 49 and 51, at Ephesus. Or if we take his words literally, the nine months which are not accounted for in the nineteenth chapter, would afford ample time for the voyage to Crete; and, even if he passed the winter months of one of those years at Nicopolis, still he might have said to the Ephesians, "Remember, that for three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day," ὅτι τριετίαν νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν οὐκ ἐπαυσάμην κ. τ. λ. by which he may have meant—Remember, that all the time which I passed in your city during those three years, I ceased not, &c.; or we might even suppose, that though he communicated to Titus his intention of wintering in Nicopolis, (ἐκεῖ κέκριτα παραχειμάσαι,) he may not have put that intention into practice.

The more we consider the notion of St. Paul having written to Titus during this period, the more probable it seems to us; and, if the following reasons are not thought fanciful, they may perhaps add some weight to it. We shall show presently, that the First Epistle to the Corinthians was written from Ephesus, toward the beginning of the year 52. We suppose St. Paul to have arrived at Ephesus in October or November, 48, and to have staid there during 49 and 50. In 1 Cor. xvi. 5—7, St. Paul tells the Corinthians that he meant to pay them a visit, and perhaps to winter with them, "For I do not wish now to pay you *merely a passing visit*, &c." These words would lead us to think that St. Paul had been at Corinth merely on his way from some other place, and not stopped there. But the last time we read of his being

at Corinth he staid there eighteen months; it therefore seems not improbable that his voyage to Crete, which he speaks of in his Epistle to Titus, may have been taken in the year 51, and in going or returning he visited Corinth. It may have been on this occasion that he was out at sea a day and a night, 2 Cor. xi. 25; and it would explain, what has puzzled so many Commentators, how St. Paul speaks of going to Corinth *for the third time*, 2 Cor. xii. 14; xiii. 1: whereas the visit, which he was then going to make, appears to be only the second, (though this passage will admit of another interpretation, as we shall show presently :) he had perhaps been at Corinth *ἐν παρόδῳ*, in the year 51; and we know from 2 Cor. i. 15, 16, that while St. Paul was at Ephesus he had wished very much to go to Corinth, but thought it better to refrain. So that if he touched there on his voyage to Crete, he would be likely not to stay, perhaps not even to land.

Again, in 1 Cor. xvi. 12, he says, "as touching our brother Apollos, I have greatly exhorted him to come unto you with the brethren: but his will was not at all to come at this time; but he will come when he shall have convenient time." Apollos, therefore, was not at Corinth, when St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians, but St. Paul had been urging him to go thither. When St. Paul wrote to Titus, Apollos was in Crete, or at least was expected to touch at Crete on his way from some other place: for St. Paul says, iii. 13, "Send (*πρόπεμψον*) Zenas the lawyer, and Apollos, on their journey diligently, that nothing be wanting unto them." It seems, therefore, very probable, if we compare these two passages, that St. Paul having urged Apollos to go to Corinth, and knowing that he was then in Crete, or would soon be there, wrote to Titus to give him every assistance for his voyage, that he might be able to proceed to Corinth: and the two passages thus throw light upon each other, and seem to show that the two letters were written at no great interval of time. Benson and Michaelis assert, that Apollos was at Ephesus when St. Paul wrote 1 Cor. But his words in xvi. 12 of that Epistle do not prove so much. St. Paul may have urged Apollos by letter to go to Corinth; but should he have been at Ephesus, our hypothesis concerning the Epistle to Titus is not at all affected. We suppose that Epistle to have been written toward the end of 51, and St. Paul then tells Titus to give Apollos every facility for his journey. The first Epistle to the Corinthians was written early in 52, and Apollos may have come to Ephesus in the interval. We may add, that Tychicus, who was certainly with St. Paul at the time of his writing to Titus, was a native of Asia Minor, (Acts, xx. 4,) which affords an additional probability, that the Epistle was written from Ephesus.

As to the expression in Titus, iii. 12, "Be diligent to come unto me to Nicopolis, for I have determined there to winter," it is possible, as we observed above, that St. Paul after all did not winter there; or, if he did, we have already shown, that he need not be taken literally when he says, Acts, xx. 31, that he had passed three years in Ephesus. Michaelis mentions several cities called Nicopolis, and among them "one in Cilicia, and another in Bithynia, which were not inconveniently situated, if St. Paul set sail from Ephesus, when he went into Crete, and returned from Crete into Asia Minor." It appears, also, from the speech of Demetrius the silversmith, that St. Paul had by no means confined his preaching to Ephesus, Acts, xix. 26; and the same may, perhaps, be inferred from 1 Cor. iv. 17; vii. 17.

We would conjecture, therefore, that in the summer of 51 St. Paul sailed from Ephesus in a ship which touched at Corinth, and went to Crete. He staid there some time, and leaving Titus in the island returned back to Ephesus, and soon after wrote the Epistle to Titus. He perhaps wintered at Nicopolis, and returned to Ephesus early in 52. If this be correct, the Nicopolis was probably the city of that name in Bithynia. St. Paul had wished to preach in Bithynia five years before, but was prevented, Acts, xvi. 7. This Nicopolis was at a distance of not many days' journey from Ephesus; and in what St. Paul says in this Epistle, "Be diligent to come unto me to Nicopolis," iii. 12, we may find some confirmation for the supposed date of the Epistle and the situation of this city, when we know that St. Paul, on leaving Ephesus, expected to meet Titus at Troas, 2 Cor. ii. 12, 13. It would appear that Titus was not able to join Paul at Nicopolis; and the Apostle had consequently sent to him to desire that he would meet him at Troas. For some reason or other he could not meet him at Troas, but joined him in Macedonia, 2 Cor. vii. 5, 6: and it appears from this passage, that on his way he had passed through Corinth, 7, having arrived there subsequently to the delivery of St. Paul's first Epistle, 8. Titus, therefore, did not reach Corinth till just before or after Easter; (as will appear from our remarks upon 1 Cor.) being unable to join St. Paul at Nicopolis, he probably remained during the winter in Crete; and the fact of his taking Corinth on his way, when he was going from Crete to Troas is a confirmation of the conjecture made above, that St. Paul touched at Corinth, when he was on his voyage from Ephesus to Crete. It appears, also, from 2 Cor. vii. 14, that previous to this meeting between St. Paul and Titus, the Apostle had spoken highly to him of the Corinthians; which proves that they must have been together subsequent to St. Paul's long residence in Corinth; and

again makes it probable, that St. Paul left Titus in Crete, and wrote his Epistle to him in the year 51.

We should mention, that the notion of this Epistle being written toward the close of St. Paul's long residence at Ephesus has been maintained by Capellus; but he thinks that St. Paul visited Crete at the beginning of his second journey, after having gone through Cilicia, Acts, xv. 41, and before his arrival at Derbe and Lystra, xvi. 1, an hypothesis, which we conceive to be utterly untenable.

Galatians, A.D. 52.—The date of the Epistle to the Galatians has caused as great difficulties as that of the Epistle to Titus. We will pursue the same plan as before, of mentioning the different opinions in the order of time:—

1. Semler speaks of a German, who supposes it to have been written previous to the Council at Jerusalem. This was the opinion of Weingart and of Beza.

2. Macknight dates it from Antioch after the Council, and before St. Paul's second journey, Acts, xv. 30.

3. Michaelis, who is followed by Townsend, supposes it to have been written on St. Paul's second journey, and probably from Thessalonica, Acts, xvii. 1.

4. Drusius, L'Enfant, Beausobre, Dr. A. Clarke, Lardner, Benson, Barrington, and Tomline, all agree in supposing St. Paul to have written it at Corinth during his long residence there, Acts, xviii. 11.

5. Capellus, Witsius, Wall, Rosenmüller, Bertholdt, and Hug date it from Ephesus, when St. Paul was there for the second time, and staid there three years, Acts, xix. 1.

6. Grotius, Fabricius, and Pearson suppose it to have been sent from Corinth, during St. Paul's second residence there, Acts, xx. 3.

7. Theodoret conceived it to have been written from Rome, as is expressed in the subscription to the Epistle in most manuscripts, and in the Synopsis Scripturæ. (Athan. vol. ii. p. 194.) Lightfoot has also adopted this notion.

Of these numerous hypotheses, the two first must be dismissed immediately; for they suppose the Epistle to have been written before St. Paul's second journey; but it was during this journey that St. Paul visited the Galatians for the first time; consequently the date of the Epistle must be subsequent to that visit.

The two next opinions may also be proved untenable. The former of them dates the Epistle from Thessalonica, the latter from Corinth. According to either of these opinions St. Paul had visited Galatia previous to his writing the Epistle; but he says, iv. 13, "Ye know how through infirmity of the flesh I preached the Gospel unto you *at the first*," or rather, *the first*

time, εὐηγγελισάμεν ὑμῖν τὸ πρότερον. This expression clearly indicates, that St. Paul had visited the Galatian churches more than once; consequently the Epistle must have been written later than during his residence at Thessalonica or Corinth. It is singular, that this passage should have been overlooked by so many critics, who have argued for the early date of this Epistle from the fact of only one journey being mentioned in it. Benson observes, that “there is no hint, throughout the *whole epistle*, of his having at that time been more than once among them.” This erroneous statement has been incautiously followed by Michaelis, Tomline, and Townsend. The German critics, Rosenmüller and Hug, have seen the truth of the matter, and consequently assigned a date to the Epistle subsequent to St. Paul's second visit to Galatia. We cannot forbear noticing, in this place, a most absurd interpretation of Hug, who explains the expression quoted above, δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς εὐηγγελισάμεν ὑμῖν, to mean, that the Apostle made allowances for human frailty that he might not give offence by severer doctrines. Hug is probably the only person (even in Germany) who would understand δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς to mean *with a consideration for human frailty*. There can be little question that Bishop Bull is right, in interpreting these words of the infirmity, whatever it might be, which in the next verse St. Paul calls *the temptation in his flesh*; and which he mentions more plainly in 2 Cor. xii. 7—9, as well as in 1 Cor. ii. 3; 2 Cor. x. 10.

St. Paul's second visit to Galatia is recorded in Acts, xviii. 23 and xix. 1; and took place A.D. 48, according to our own chronological arrangement: consequently the Epistle to the Galatians must have been written after this time; and we may add, as an additional reason for coming to this conclusion, that St. Paul sends his salutation to *the Churches* of Galatia, i. 2; an expression which would seem to denote, that some time must have elapsed since the first preaching of the Gospel among them, or the Christians could hardly have formed themselves into distinct bodies. In the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, which were written a short time after St. Paul's visit to them, he addresses himself to *the Church* at Thessalonica, and in 1 & 2 Cor. he only speaks of *the Church* at Corinth.

As to the fifth and sixth hypotheses, which suppose the Epistle to have been written from Ephesus, A.D. 49—52, or from Corinth, A.D. 52—53, we can see nothing in the internal evidence which can disprove either opinion; and upon the whole we are inclined to adopt the former.

Michaelis, who argues in favour of an earlier date, observes, upon the authority of Epiphanius, (Hær. xlii. 9,) that the heretic

Marcion, conceived it to be the earliest of St. Paul's Epistles. Tertullian is also said, by the same critic, to have entertained this notion. Grotius had said the same before him: and they allude to Tertullian's words (*adv. Marcion. i. 20.*) where he is speaking of Peter, James, and John being rebuked by Paul, who "*adhuc in gratiâ rudis, trepidans ne in vacuum cucurrisset aut curreret, tunc primum cum antecessoribus Apostolis conferebat.*" But these words prove nothing as to the date of the Epistle; they only describe the condition of St. Paul when he acted as is related in this Epistle: and if he had written it twenty years after the time alluded to, Tertullian might still have spoken of him as being a novice when he rebuked the Apostles; but it does not at all follow that he was a novice when he wrote the Epistle.

Almost every commentator has noticed an expression in Gal. i. 6, "I marvel that ye are *so soon* removed from him that called you, &c.:" and from the words *so soon* they infer, that the Epistle must have been written not long after the first conversion of the Galatians. This argument is dwelt upon by Benson, Michaelis, Macknight, Rosenmüller, Tomline, Townsend, Bertholdt, and Hug: but we confess that we cannot see the force of it. It is true, that if St. Paul converted the Galatians in 46, and heard within a year or two after, that false teachers had perverted his doctrine, he might very reasonably have said, "I marvel, that ye are so soon removed," &c. But he might also have used the same expression, if at any subsequent period a new and erroneous doctrine had spread *rapidly* among them. Thus let us suppose, that St. Paul had continued for some years to receive good accounts of his Galatian converts, as we know that he found them firm and steady on his second visit, Acts, xviii. 23; but that after some years, he was informed of a false teacher having been among them, whose doctrines had spread very rapidly. If St. Paul wrote to them at that time, might he not say, "I marvel, that ye are so soon removed," &c.? In the same manner we read in Josephus, μέχρη πολλοῦ ἀπορῶ, τί δὴ ποτε καὶ τὸ κινήσαν ὑμᾶς οὕτω ταχέως ἐγένετο, *I cannot conceive what has set you upon coming hither in such a hurry.*—(B. J. iv. 4.) If a Whig or a Tory had continued firm to his party through many sessions, but upon a sudden change of ministry went over to the side which he had before opposed, might we not say, notwithstanding his long adherence to his first opinions, "I marvel that you have so soon changed your politics?" In the Greek it is οὕτω ταχέως, which might be better rendered, *so quickly*; and if St. Paul's expression may be referred to the suddenness and quickness of change among the Galatians, we must allow that the argument drawn from this passage is at least neutral, and cannot be brought to

demonstrate that the Epistle was written at a very short period subsequent to the conversion of the Galatians: to which we may add, that according to our hypothesis it was written within four years from St. Paul's second visit to them.

We have already disproved the notion of Michaelis, that the Epistle was written during St. Paul's second journey. But he advances another argument in support of its early date, which is, that the seduction of the Galatians may be more easily referred to an early than a later period, because it appears from Acts, xv. 1, that Asia Minor swarmed at that time with zealots, who wished to impose on the Christians the observance of the Levitical Law. But not a word is said in Acts, xv. 1, of *Asia Minor*; and the zealots in question evidently came to Antioch; so that nothing can be inferred from this passage as to the time when Judaizing teachers first went into Galatia. Michaelis also dwells upon the fact, that St. Paul, in giving a history of his life, breaks off at the period of the Apostolic Council in Jerusalem, whence it is probable, that from that time to the time of his writing to the Galatians, nothing remarkable had happened. But Michaelis seems to have forgotten the design of St. Paul in giving this sketch of his life. It was evidently to prove, what the Judaizing teachers appear to have denied, that he was truly an apostle: hence he gives an account of his conduct between his conversion and the time of his first apostolic journey; in which period, if at all, he must have received his divine commission. He naturally stops at the time immediately preceding his first journey: subsequent to that period he had been acting as an apostle, whether he was justified in doing so or no; and in labouring to prove to the Galatians that he was so justified, he of course did not dwell upon his missionary labours, when his legitimate call to this office was the very point in dispute. This argument of Michaelis therefore settles nothing as to the date of the Epistle.

We are inclined, as we said above, to think that it was written from Ephesus, in the year 52; and perhaps we may find some reasons for adopting this opinion in the similarity which exists between passages in this Epistle and the First to the Corinthians, which was certainly written from Ephesus in the spring of 52. It is plain, from 1 Cor. ix. 1—3, that some persons had raised doubts at Corinth as to St. Paul being properly an Apostle: the same objections had been raised in Galatia; and the first part of the Epistle to the Galatians is taken up in refuting them. It is not improbable, therefore, that they were written at the same time. In each Epistle he alludes to his infirmity,—Gal. iv. 13. and 1 Cor. ii. 3. We would also wish our readers to compare Gal. v. 6. and 1 Cor. vii. 19; Gal. v. 9. and 1 Cor. v. 6.; and

the train of thought in the Apostle's mind seems to have been so much the same when writing the two Epistles, that we should be much inclined to think them written at the same time. There is a remarkable passage in 1 Cor. xvi. 1. "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given orders to the Churches of Galatia, even so do ye." The Epistle to the Galatians contains no such order; for though Capellus and others have referred to vi. 6. 10. as containing exhortations to charity, the references certainly are not much to the point. But there is nothing unreasonable in supposing, as Capellus himself has done, that when St. Paul sent it, he added, by the messenger, some directions concerning these collections; and proceeding immediately after to write to the Corinthians, he had these orders fresh in his memory, and alluded to them in the words just quoted; which may mean—"With respect to the collections for the Saints, (which is one of the subjects you inquire about,) I have just been giving some directions to the Galatians, by the bearer of an epistle to them, and I may repeat the same to you." These coincidences may not appear very striking, but being unable to find any more plausible hypothesis, we are inclined to fix upon this date, and to think that the Epistle to the Galatians was written from Ephesus at the same time with the First to the Corinthians. We shall show, presently, that 1 Corinthians was written before Easter, A. D. 52; and perhaps at the time when St. Paul returned to Ephesus from his winter's sojourn in Nicopolis. We may suppose that he found some accounts of the different Churches waiting his arrival (see 2 Cor. xi. 28); we know that he received a letter from Corinth, and a similar communication may have been made to him from Galatia. We have placed the Epistle to the Galatians first, because we think that it bears marks of having been written before 1 Corinthians, though both were sent about the same time. And having given these reasons for supposing it to be written from Ephesus, in the year 52, we shall not say any thing more of the sixth and seventh hypotheses, which suppose the Epistle to have been written from Corinth or Rome.

1 Corinthians. A. D. 52.—The date of this Epistle can be settled, beyond all doubt, from the internal evidence, and by a reference to the Acts of the Apostles. At the time of writing it, St. Paul was in Ephesus, where he intended to stay till Pentecost (xvi. 8). He had sent Timothy to the Corinthians, (iv. 17) meaning to see them soon himself, (iv. 19) and perhaps to winter at Corinth (xvi. 6); but he intended first to pass through Macedonia (xvi. 5); and from Corinth he meant to go to Jerusalem (xvi. 4). Now if we turn to the Acts of the Apostles, (xix. 21, 22,)

we find that toward the close of St. Paul's residence in Ephesus, "Paul purposed in the spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem; so he sent into Macedonia two of them that ministered unto him, Timotheus and Erastus, but he himself staid in Asia for a season." It is impossible for any agreement to be stronger than between these two verses in the Acts and the notices collected above from 1 Corinthians. The Epistle, therefore, was written some time in 52, and before Pentecost. The ingenious idea of Michaelis has been generally adopted, that in 1 Cor. v. 8. there is an allusion to the approaching feast of Easter; from which he concludes that the Epistle was written at the Easter preceding this Pentecost; but he should rather have said, that the Epistle was written at such a time that it would arrive at Corinth shortly before Easter. The Epistle, therefore, was written toward the end of winter, or at the beginning of spring, in 52; at which time we have supposed St. Paul to have returned from Nicopolis to Ephesus. Here, it appears that he received accounts of some of his Churches; and accordingly we have supposed him at this time to have written his Epistle to the Galatians. It would appear, from 2 Cor. i. 15, 16. 23; ii. 1. that no very favourable account had come to him from Corinth in the year previous. He heard, also, of the state of things there partly from some of the family of Chloe, (1 Cor. i. 11.) and partly by a letter written to him from the Corinthians themselves (vii. 1). It seems probable that this letter was brought to Ephesus by Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus (xvi. 17); though they may, perhaps, have arrived subsequently to the letter. Benson and Hug have asserted that Apollos was at Ephesus at this time; which they collect from xvi. 12; and Hug supposes that Apollos and Sosthenes were the bearers of the letter from Corinth. But neither of these opinions can be proved.

What we can collect for certain is, that the First Epistle to the Corinthians was written from Ephesus, in 52, at such a time that the bearer of it, travelling through Macedonia, would reach Corinth by Easter;—we say, travelling through Macedonia, because St. Luke expressly says, that St. Paul sent Timothy and Erastus into Macedonia. The name of Erastus is not mentioned in this Epistle, which can easily be accounted for, by supposing that while Erastus staid in Macedonia, Timothy was to proceed alone to Corinth; and St. Paul made this selection because Timothy had been his companion during his first residence at Corinth. Hug has shown, by a calculation of time and distances, that if Timothy set out from Ephesus at the beginning of March, he might easily reach Corinth by the beginning of

April, the distance requiring a period of about thirty-one days; so that the Epistle was probably written some time in February, and Timothy would arrive with it at Corinth before Easter. If it be thought, from 1 Cor. xvi. 10, that Timothy had left Ephesus before the writing of this letter, and that St. Paul expected the letter to reach Corinth before the arrival of Timothy, then we may adopt the notion of Hug and Bertholdt, that Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus, carried back this answer of St. Paul; and if they went direct from Ephesus to Corinth, they may have performed the journey in sixteen days.

We might, perhaps, infer from this Epistle, that St. Paul intended to reach Corinth, not only just before Easter, but also not long before the celebration of the Isthmian games; and Corsini has calculated that these games were celebrated alternately in the months of July and April. If they were in April this year, the expression of St. Paul, in 1 Cor. ix. 24—26, would possess additional force; and there are reasons for believing that the Isthmian games were celebrated this year. It is known that the time of the solemnity was every third year, *i. e.* two years intervened between each celebration; and it appears, from a coin which was struck in honour of Nero's voyage to Greece, that he was then in the thirteenth year of his reign; this was the year 67, for he began his reign in October, 54, and the games were celebrated in the spring or summer; consequently, by the thirteenth year of his reign we understand the year 67. We have also the positive testimony of Josephus, that Nero passed the whole of the thirteenth year of his reign in Greece (B. J. ii. 20, 1; iii. 1. 3; 10, 10). We may therefore assume, that in the year 67 Nero contended at the Isthmian games; and if we calculate back every third year, we shall find that they must have been celebrated in 52. It might be argued, perhaps, from a passage in Suetonius, that the fact of these games being celebrated in 67, proves nothing; for that historian tells us, (Nero, 23,) that the emperor obliged the Greeks to have the games, which belonged properly to different years, all celebrated in one year. But if we turn to Tacitus, (Annal. XV. 33, 36,) it appears that Nero's first ambition was to exhibit at the Isthmian games; it is probable, therefore, that he would have selected a year in which they were regularly celebrated, and that he made the others accommodate themselves to them. It can be proved, indeed, that this was the case; for Nero went to Naples in 64, intending to proceed to Corinth, that he might contend at the Isthmian games; but if they were celebrated in 64, the regular time for the next celebration was in 67;—so that it seems certain that they were celebrated in these two years. And if we count

back from either of them, we are brought to the year 52, in which we suppose St. Paul to have alluded to those games in 1 Corinthians. The coincidence is, at least, worthy of remark; and if the Apostle took advantage of the Jewish solemnity to say to his converts, "Let *us* keep the feast, not with old leaven," &c. he may also have taken advantage of the approaching heathen solemnity, and said, "So run, that ye may obtain . . . they do it to obtain a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible." We may add, that the metaphor appears to us to be kept up to the end of the twenty-seventh verse; and that ἀδύκνιμος is used with reference to a man who had been trained for athletic exercises, but rejected as unfit for a public exhibition.

We have observed above, that St. Paul intended to remain at Ephesus till Pentecost (xvi. 8); and if Timothy passed the Easter at Corinth, he could easily return to Ephesus before Pentecost, which is what St. Paul intended him to do (xvi. 11). It appears, however, that the riot in the theatre at Ephesus deranged St. Paul's plans, and caused him to leave Ephesus before the time fixed (Acts, xx. 1). The spurious subscription to this Epistle, which dates it from Philippi, is not worth attending to; but it may be mentioned, that the Synopsis Scripturæ, already alluded to, dates it from Ephesus.

1 Timothy. A.D. 52.—We have only met with three opinions concerning the date of this Epistle; two of which are supported by a host of authorities. Baronius, Grotius, Salmasius, Hammond, Lightfoot, Benson, Lardner, Michaelis, Bertholdt, and Hug, are the most distinguished maintainers of the notion, that it was written by St. Paul soon after he left Ephesus, in 52. The German critic, Paulus, stands alone in supposing it to have been written from Cæsarea, while St. Paul was in prison there (Acts, xxiv. 27); but he has been sufficiently refuted by Bertholdt. Pearson, Le Clerc, Usher, Cave, Fabricius, Mill, Macknight, L'Enfant, Rosenmüller, and Paley, conceived it to be written after the Apostle's release from imprisonment in Rome. We have no hesitation in adopting the first of these hypotheses, for the following reasons.

It is expressly said in this Epistle, (i. 3,) that St. Paul, when he was setting out for Macedonia, exhorted Timothy to remain in Ephesus; and every commentator has understood this passage to imply, that St. Paul himself was about to leave Ephesus when he gave this exhortation. Now St. Paul never went from Ephesus to Macedonia except in the year 52, after his three years' residence in that city. We make this assertion on the authority of St. Paul's own words, in Acts, xx. 25, where he tells the elders of Ephesus that none of them would ever see his face

again. These words were spoken in the year following; and though Paley, Tomline and others, have endeavoured to argue that the Apostle did not speak from inspiration, that he might be mistaken, &c. we cannot listen to such reasoning; history never mentions any subsequent visit which he made to Ephesus; and in support of such a notion we have nothing but conjecture, and that in direct opposition to a solemn prophecy delivered by the Apostle. We conclude, therefore, (and in this we have Michaelis on our side,) that St. Paul was never at Ephesus after the year 52; and as he had lately left it, and was going to Macedonia, when he wrote this Epistle, he must have written it in 52. Benson conceives that it was written from Troas, which was also the opinion of Hammond; but we must agree with Michaelis, that though the date of the Epistle is certain, we cannot decide accurately as to the place from whence it was sent.

It appears, from 1 Cor. xvi. 11, that when St. Paul sent Timothy through Macedonia to Corinth, he ordered him to return to him at Ephesus, and expected him to come before Pentecost. We have also observed, that it was very possible for him to do so; but that St. Paul left Ephesus sooner than he intended, on account of the riot in the theatre. Benson and Hug, however, suppose that Timothy returned to Ephesus before St. Paul left it. Perhaps he did; but the words in 1 Tim. i. 3, "I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia," would not necessarily prove this. Being obliged to quit Ephesus before Timothy was arrived, he may have left instructions for him and pressed him to stay there if he could; but if he saw Timothy previous to setting out, he probably had but a short interview, and the reason of his writing this Epistle was, that he had no time to give his instructions personally. Tomline, who supported the later date of this Epistle, thought that it could not have been written now, because St. Paul does not allude in it to the persecutions which he had received; but if Timothy arrived at Ephesus before St. Paul left it, he must have been present at the riot in the theatre, (Acts, xx. 1,) and therefore knew the whole story, beside having been able to hear from the Apostle's own mouth the history of his sufferings. And if they had not met, he would hear all this from other persons, which would make it quite unnecessary for St. Paul to dwell upon those topics, while his whole letter was one of business and instructions.

Another objection, which was brought against the earlier date, is, that St. Paul says, (iii. 14, and iv. 13,) that he hoped to join Timothy at Ephesus shortly; whereas, it appears, that he was at that time only beginning a journey through Macedonia to Corinth,

and never returned to Ephesus again. This, however, is no objection at all. We have already stated, that a journey from Corinth to Ephesus, even through Macedonia, did not require more than a month; a voyage by sea would not occupy above half the time; and there is nothing unreasonable in supposing, that when St. Paul wrote this Epistle, he intended to return soon to Ephesus, but subsequently changed his plan. It appears, from 2 Cor. i. 1, that Timothy did not stay in Ephesus, but joined the Apostle on his journey through Macedonia; and this may have been one reason why St. Paul altered his intentions of going to Ephesus. In the same manner he told the Corinthians, in his first Epistle, that he meant to stay in Ephesus till Pentecost, (xvi. 8,) but, on account of the disturbance in the theatre, he left it sooner. So, also, he had once intended to go to Corinth from Ephesus previous to going to Macedonia, but he afterwards abandoned this design, 2 Cor. i. 15, 16.

The fact of Timothy not remaining in Ephesus has been also alleged as an argument against St. Paul having written the Epistle at this time; for, since St. Paul exhorted Timothy to do so, it has been represented as highly improbable that he would have disobeyed such an injunction. But we know enough of the state of things at Ephesus at that time to account for his being obliged, like St. Paul, to leave it abruptly. When the Apostle wrote first to the Corinthians, he represented himself as daily in danger (xv. 30); in his second Epistle he speaks even still more strongly (i. 8. 10); and we know that the storm, which had been gathering, burst very shortly upon him, and forced him to depart. Aquila and Priscilla also left Ephesus soon after St. Paul; (compare 1 Cor. xvi. 19, Rom. xvi. 3;) and the Apostle himself tells us, that they had been in great danger, Rom. xvi. 4. In the same manner Timothy may have found it expedient to leave Ephesus for a time, and rejoin his master upon his travels.

The advocates for the early date of the Epistle have argued from those words of St. Paul, (iv. 12,) "Let no man despise thy youth:" and Benson and Michaelis observe, that if we suppose Timothy to have been twenty when St. Paul first took him with him, he would be about twenty-seven now; whereas, if the Epistle was written after St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome, Timothy was then thirty-four or thirty-five; and St. Paul would not have been likely to anticipate objections to him on account of his youth. According to our own chronology, he would be about twenty-six at the present time, and thirty-three at the period of St. Paul's release; and though the difference in age does not appear to us so striking, it is certainly more probable, that St. Paul should allude to his youth when he was twenty-six, than

when he was thirty-three; and if we recollect that in 1 Cor., which we suppose to have been written not long before, St. Paul says of Timothy, "Let no man despise him," (xvi. 11,) the coincidence between the two passages may afford another ground for believing that we have assigned a right date to the Epistle to Timothy. We may add, that the Synopsis Scripturæ dates it from Macedonia; an opinion which may possibly be the true one: but we would rather agree with Hammond and Benson in supposing it to be written at Troas, or at some other place nearer to Ephesus.

2 Corinthians, A.D. 52.—The second Epistle to the Corinthians was written in the summer or autumn of 52, when St. Paul was in Macedonia, on his way from Ephesus to the south of Greece (vii. 5; ix. 2). He had expected to meet Titus at Troas, (ii. 12, 13,) but was not joined by him till he had entered Macedonia (vii. 6). Titus had passed through Corinth on his road, and brought an account to St. Paul of the reception of his first Epistle in that city. Timothy had also been obliged to leave Ephesus, and, following St. Paul, overtook him in Macedonia; for his name is joined with St. Paul in the salutation to the Corinthian church. We cannot collect from the Epistle in what place of Macedonia St. Paul was at present staying, but there is no reason why the subscription to the Epistle should not in this instance be correct, which states it to have been written from Philippi.

It is plain, from both the Epistles to the Corinthians, that, when St. Paul set out upon this journey, he was very anxious to visit Corinth; and, in this second Epistle, he tells them that he had originally intended to go to Corinth previous to going into Macedonia, and after he had been in the latter country to visit them again (i. 15, 16). The first of these two visits he had abandoned: at least, if he was at Corinth at all between the years 48 and 52, it was only ἐν παρόδῳ, when we have supposed him to have touched there on his voyage to Crete. This will enable us to explain two expressions in the second Epistle, which have perplexed the commentators, where St. Paul says, "*The third time* I am ready to come to you," τρίτον ἐτοίμως ἔχω ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, xii. 14: "This is the third time I am coming to you," τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, xiii. 1. The New Testament certainly speaks only of one visit of St. Paul to Corinth before this time; but the words just quoted, even in the English version, and certainly in the Greek, may be understood to mean, that this was the third time that he had *intended* to visit them. On the *first* occasion he had spent eighteen months among them: he had already told them, in i. 15, 16, of this Epistle, that he had fully purposed to visit them a

second time, but gave it up out of consideration for themselves : the third visit he was now on the point of paying them : and thus the whole difficulty of the two passages is removed, as Hug and Bertholdt have already shown.

Though Titus was so lately come from Corinth, St. Paul prevailed upon him to be the bearer of this second Epistle, and to prepare the Corinthians for his coming in person (viii. 6. 17). He also sent with him two other persons, whose names are not mentioned. He says of the one, "We have sent with him the brother, whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the churches; and not that only, but who was also chosen of the churches to travel with us with this grace" (viii. 18, 19). It has been supposed, both in ancient and modern times, that St. Luke was the brother intended in this passage. Such was the notion of Origen, and probably of Jerom, and of the interpolator of the Epistles of Ignatius. The spurious subscription to this Epistle also states that it was carried by St. Luke. Grotius, Capellus, Benson and Macknight, have adopted this opinion; and others have expressed themselves rather favourably towards it. Chrysostom considered that Barnabas was intended; and some have put forward the claims of Apollos. Those, who have supposed St. Luke to be the brother here mentioned, were probably led to that opinion by the words quoted above, "Whose praise is in the Gospel:" but Erasmus and others have shown very clearly that the word *Gospel*, as used by St. Paul, meant, not a written Gospel, in the modern acceptance of the word, but the preaching of the Gospel: thus, in this Epistle, (x. 14,) he says, "We are come as far as to you also in preaching the Gospel of Christ," ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. So, also, in Phil. iv. 3, "Help those women which laboured with me in the Gospel," ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ: and, in v. 15, "Know also, that in the beginning of the Gospel, when I departed from Macedonia," &c. ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. In all these places, (and more might be added,) the *Gospel* means the preaching of the Gospel: and in the words quoted above, "Whose praise is in the Gospel," St. Paul evidently meant, that the praise of this brother consisted in his having preached the Gospel throughout all the churches. We cannot see the slightest reason for believing that St. Luke was the person meant by St. Paul; if he had been, it is hardly possible that he should not have mentioned more distinctly that St. Paul went to Corinth, which we can prove that he did; but St. Luke only says generally, that he staid three months in Greece, Acts, xx. 2, 3. With respect to Chrysostom's notion, that it was Barnabas, he was probably misled by those words in v. 19, "Who was chosen of the churches to travel with us." It is true that Barnabas was chosen by the churches to travel with

St. Paul on his first journey; but he was not with him on the present journey: and, from this very expression, we should have no hesitation in saying that Silas or Silvanus was the person intended. The Greek words in v. 19 are, *χειροτονηθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν συνέδημος ἡμῶν σὺν τῇ χάριτι ταύτῃ*, which would seem to show that this person, whoever he was, had been the companion of St. Paul from the time of his leaving Antioch; and such we know was the case with Silvanus, Acts, xv. 40, where it is said that he set out with St. Paul *παραδοθεὶς τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν*. It appears that St. Luke did not join St. Paul till he arrived at Troas for the first time, Acts, xvi. 10. It may be added, that Silvanus had been with St. Paul at Corinth during his eighteen months' residence there; which would make him particularly acceptable to the Corinthians on the present occasion.

The other companion of Titus, mentioned in v. 22, has been supposed by some to have been Apollos; and Grotius conceived him to be Epānetus, Rom. xvi. 5. Benson thought that this was Silas; but we think it much more probable that he was the brother mentioned in v. 18: and, as to the third bearer of the Epistle, we see nothing in the words of St. Paul to enable us to form any opinion: but since St. Paul couples Sosthenes with himself in his salutation to the Corinthians in his first Epistle, (i. 1,) it seems probable that he was personally known to them, and may therefore have been the brother here intended. If he was the Sosthenes mentioned in Acts, xviii. 17, as some persons have thought, he was probably a Corinthian.

Romans. A.D. 53.—The internal evidence of this Epistle leaves no room for doubt as to its date, and the place from whence it was written. St. Luke tells us in the Acts, xx. 1. 3, that after St. Paul had gone through Macedonia, he staid three months in Greece; and speaking of the same route in xix. 21, he specifies *Achaia*. St. Paul, in 1 Cor. iv. 19; xvi. 6; 2 Cor. xii. 14; xiii. 1, declares his intention of proceeding to Corinth, and wintering there; after which he was going to Jerusalem with the collections of the Macedonian and Achæan churches, 1 Cor. xvi. 3. The Epistle to the Romans was written at the end of a long journey, which had extended from Jerusalem to the confines of Illyria (xv. 19); and St. Paul was now on the point of setting out for Jerusalem with the money collected for the saints (25). It has also been proved by Benson and others, that the Epistle was written from Corinth, for St. Paul speaks of Caius being his host (xvi. 23); and at St. Paul's first visit at Corinth, Caius certainly lived there, 1 Cor. i. 14. He also names Erastus the chamberlain of the city (xvi. 23); meaning, evidently, the city from which he was then writing; but, from 2 Tim. iv. 20, it appears very

probable that Erastus lived at Corinth. These two last arguments were advanced by Origen (or his translator Ruffinus) in his commentary upon this Epistle.

If we put all these circumstances together, it appears demonstrable, that the Epistle to the Romans was written early in 53. St. Paul left Ephesus for Macedonia before Pentecost, 52; and the only notification of time which we have is, that he staid three months in Greece, Acts, xx. 2, 3. He then set out for Macedonia, and was at Troas five days after Easter, 6. It is therefore plain, as we observed, that the Epistle was written early in 53; for St. Paul was about to leave Corinth when he wrote it, (Rom. xv. 23. 25.) and he need not have left Corinth long before Easter in order to reach Troas five days after it. It is not improbable, that the whole of the three months, which St. Luke says that he spent in Greece, were passed in Corinth, and we may suppose them to have been the winter months. Consequently the time between Pentecost and October, or November, 52, was spent in Macedonia and the journey to Corinth. It appears from 2 Cor. vii. 5, that St. Paul met with great opposition in Macedonia, and yet he praises the zeal and liberality of the Macedonian churches, viii. 1—5. He probably, therefore, staid a considerable time in that country; nor would he have written his second Epistle to the Corinthians, if he had been travelling quickly himself, for he evidently intended the letter to reach them some time before his own arrival. In Rom. xv. 19. he speaks of having preached from Jerusalem to the confines of Illyria, μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ, and without seeking for any other journey which is not recorded in the Acts, we may well suppose him to have alluded to his present journey, which had already occupied seven years; and having past six or seven months of the present year in Macedonia, he may reasonably have said that he had gone to the borders of Illyria.

Ephesians. Colossians. Philemon. Philippians.—A.D. 58. It is asserted by Michaelis, that Eusebius is the earliest writer who speaks of St. Paul having made two journies to Rome. Michaelis is so far correct, that no writer more ancient than Eusebius has recorded with such distinctness, that St. Paul, after his two years' imprisonment, and having made his defence, set out again to preach the Gospel, and returned a second time to Rome, where he received the crown of martyrdom. All this is recorded by Eusebius, ii. 22. But Clemens Romanus, the fellow-labourer of St. Paul, tells us in his Epistle, c. v. that the Apostle travelled *to the extremity of the west*; and without contending with Stillingfleet, that these words allude to a journey which was made by St. Paul to Britain, we may assert with confidence, that they mean something more than St. Paul's visit to Rome. That city could

not, with any propriety, be called the extremity of the west; and we may therefore assert, upon the contemporary authority of Clemens, that St. Paul made a journey to some country westward of Rome; and since the history in the Acts terminates with his arrival in Rome, up to which time he certainly had made no such journey, it follows as a necessary consequence, that he must have undertaken it subsequent to his imprisonment. That St. Paul met his death in Rome, rests upon such an unbroken chain of early ecclesiastical testimony, that no critic of the present day would venture to dispute it: the fact, therefore, which Michaelis represents as so very problematical and as still undecided, viz. whether St. Paul twice visited Rome, may be received as a matter of fact upon the authority, not only of Eusebius, who lived in the fourth century, but of Clemens, who was a companion of St. Paul.

We will now look to the New Testament itself, and examine whether we can find passages which bring us to the same conclusion. If the prophetic words of our Saviour in Matt. xxiv. 14. relate to the destruction of Jerusalem, they would lead us to expect that previous to that event, the Gospel was preached in the west as well as in the east. But without resting much upon this argument, we read at the close of the Acts, that St. Paul continued two years at Rome, in his own hired house. We allow that these words do not necessarily imply that St. Paul passed no more than two years at that time in Rome, or that at the expiration of that period he was released from prison. But it certainly is highly probable that this was the case. Again, unless we suppose St. Paul to have been completely deceived, not once only, but several times, in the earnest expectation which he had formed of being released, we are bound to believe that this release actually took place, and that he quitted Rome. When he wrote to Philemon, he was so sanguine of obtaining his acquittal, that he asked him to provide a lodging for him at Colossæ, 22. When he wrote to the Philippians, he hoped to pay them a visit, i. 26, 27. ii. 24, and he expresses the same hope when he wrote to the Hebrews, xiii. 23. If these Epistles were written during St. Paul's imprisonment, and if we believe him to have had any particle of inspiration when writing about his own affairs, it follows, as Michaelis himself contends, that we are bound to believe that he was released from imprisonment, and that he visited at least some of these churches.

But if we look to the second Epistle to Timothy, the fact of St. Paul having undertaken a journey subsequent to the two years' confinement mentioned in the Acts, is capable almost of demonstration. He there speaks of having left his cloak and some books at Troas, iv. 13; and since he did not go near to Troas on his first voyage to Rome, and the last time of his being at that city

was three years previous to his arriving in Rome, we can hardly think that he had delayed so long to send for his property, but must conclude that he had touched at Troas not long before the time of writing this Epistle. He also speaks of having left Trophimus ill at Miletus, iv. 20; and we know that Trophimus was with St. Paul at Jerusalem previous to his apprehension, Acts, xxi. 29, and that the ship which brought St. Paul to Rome, did not go near to Miletus, so that he must allude to some other voyage which was made subsequent to the history of the Acts. We need not stop to expose the absurd interpretation of Hug, who says that *Τρόφιμον δὲ ἀπέλιπον ἐν Μιλήτῳ* may mean "*they left Trophimus at Miletus.*" The form of expression in v. 12, *Τυχικὸν δὲ ἀπέστειλα εἰς Ἑρῆσον*, and the very same word recurring in v. 13, *τὸν φαίδονην ὃν ἀπέλιπον ἐν τῇ Τρωάδι*, are sufficient to refute such a notion. We have therefore proved that at some period subsequent to the two years' imprisonment mentioned in the Acts, St. Paul visited Troas and Miletus; it has been thought also, from 2 Tim. iv. 20, that he had visited Corinth; so that in addition to the testimony of Clemens Romanus and Eusebius, we have the evidence of St. Paul himself, that he twice visited Rome.

It needs no argument to show that the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians, were written when St. Paul was in confinement. The Apostle's own words declare it in the following passages, Eph. iii. 1, iv. 1. vi. 20; Col. iv. 4. 18; Philemon, 1. 9. 10. 13; Philip. i. 7. 13. 14. 16. We have also assumed, that these four Epistles were written during the Apostle's first confinement, which notion is grounded upon the passages quoted above, in which St. Paul expresses such a confident hope of being released. It may be proved without difficulty, that the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians and Philemon, were written about the same time, for they were sent by the same messengers, Tychicus and Onesimus, (compare Eph. vi. 21, 22, Col. iv. 7—9, Philemon, 10, 11,) and the same persons, Timothy, Epaphras, Aristarchus, Mark, Luke, and Demas, were all with the Apostle when he wrote to the Colossians and Philemon. Philemon, indeed, lived at Colossæ, so that it was very natural that St. Paul should write the two Epistles at the same time; and unless we suppose that Tychicus made two journeys to Asia Minor, it is also evident that the Epistle to the Ephesians was sent with the other two. From the circumstance of Timothy's name being mentioned in the salutation to the Colossians, Philippians and Philemon, but not to the Ephesians, Hug concludes that the latter Epistle was written before the arrival of Timothy at Rome; but we need not say that such an inference carries with it little weight; and whoever compares the two Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians,

will require no farther proof that they were written about the same time, while the same ideas were passing in the Apostle's mind.

With respect to the Epistle to the Philippians, we need scarcely notice the opinion of Œder, that it was written from Corinth during St. Paul's eighteen months' residence there. We have no evidence whatever that St. Paul was then a prisoner; indeed there is positive testimony in the Acts that he was not, xviii. 9—11. Bertholdt has also refuted the notion of Paulus, that this Epistle was written from Cæsarea, while the Apostle was confined there, Acts, xxiv. 27.

It is not our intention to enter at length into the much-agitated question, whether what is called the Epistle to the Ephesians, is really the Epistle to the Laodiceans, which St. Paul tells the Colossians to procure and read in their church, iv. 16. We would only observe, that though many different interpretations have been given to passages alleged from ancient authors, the following positions may be considered as capable of demonstration: that Ignatius quoted the Epistle as addressed to the Ephesians; that Marcion asserted it to be addressed to the Laodiceans; and that Basil speaks of some ancient copies, in which the salutation was *τοῖς ἀγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, without the addition of *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*. We consider the first of these points to be proved by Michaelis; the second is expressly asserted by Tertullian, who tells us as plainly, that all the churches in his own day received the Epistle as written to the Ephesians; and the third is put in a clear light by Hug; to which it may be added, that in the Vatican MS. the words *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* occur only in the margin. And though it may be said that one of these positions neutralizes the other, and that taken together they leave the subject as obscure as before, we would rather conclude that they tend to establish the notion which was first (we believe) proposed by Archbishop Usher; that the Epistle was not addressed to the Ephesians exclusively, but was a kind of circular epistle, of which more than one copy was sent from Rome, and in some of them a blank was left in the salutation, that the name of any particular church might be added afterwards. This would explain the existence of the ancient copies which Basil had seen, in which the name of Ephesus was omitted; and it would also explain how in Marcion's copies it was called the Epistle to the Laodiceans. But as the Epistle has never been claimed except by the churches of Ephesus and Laodicea, we should rather be inclined to limit the hypothesis of Archbishop Usher, and suppose that St. Paul sent it to those two churches only. We have not seen it noticed in this controversy, that the fact of Tychicus being mentioned in the Epistle as the bearer of it, and his being sent by St. Paul to give an account of

his affairs, would seem to restrict it to those places only to which Tychicus was personally going; it could not have been intended to have been sent indiscriminately to any church in Asia Minor, or St. Paul would not have referred them so pointedly to Tychicus, "That ye may know my affairs, and how I do, Tychicus shall make known to you all things, whom *I have sent* unto you, &c." (vi. 21.) Tychicus would probably land at Ephesus, and Laodicea lay in a straight line between that city and Colossæ: and since we may infer from Col. ii. 1, iv. 13, that the Laodiceans, as well as the Colossians, had made some communication to St. Paul, it is by no means improbable, that the Apostle sent two copies of this Epistle, one of which Tychicus was to leave at Ephesus and the other at Laodicea: but without stopping in either city he was to proceed in company with Onesimus, and deliver the two other Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon. The Colossians were then to send to Laodicea, as being much nearer than Ephesus, (only seven hours' distance,) and procure a copy of the Epistle which Tychicus had left there: and though the expression of St. Paul appears to us so obscure, we must remember that Tychicus and Onesimus were present, who could perfectly understand what Epistle was intended, for they were themselves the bearers of it.

If we have satisfied our readers, that the four Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians, were written during St. Paul's first imprisonment, they perhaps will not expect us, with so few data before us, to settle precisely the year in which they were sent. Benson conceived, that they were written in the order in which we have just mentioned them: Lardner placed them thus, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon: but we have no hesitation in adopting the former arrangement, which has also been followed by Bertholdt. We have proved above, that the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon were sent at the same time by the same bearer, Tychicus: but the Epistle to the Philippians was evidently written at a different time. In the first place, it was not likely that the bearer of a letter from Rome to Ephesus would pass through Philippi; and in the next place we know, that this Epistle was carried by Epaphroditus, (ii. 25. 28.) The only notification, which is common to this Epistle with any of the others, is that of St. Paul being a prisoner, and Timothy being with him: but this would rather show, that Timothy was with St. Paul during great part of his imprisonment; and the Epistle to the Philippians so far differs from the rest, that St. Paul speaks in it of hoping to send Timothy to them shortly. It has been observed by Paley, that St. Paul must have been in Rome a considerable time when he wrote this

Epistle, since the Gospel had evidently made some progress there in consequence of his presence, and had even spread into the prætorium, and Cæsar's household, i. 12, 13. iv. 22. He also speaks of having made his defence, i. 7, from which we should infer, that the time of his release was very near at hand. It seems probable, that he had been kept in confinement a long time previous to his being called to appear before his accusers: now, however, he had made his defence; and from the expressions in i. 20—24, it might be thought that he wrote in the interval between this defence and the delivery of his sentence; though he himself well knew by the spirit of prophecy, that at this time he should be released, i. 25—27. ii. 24. When he wrote the three other Epistles, several persons were with him, such as Aristarchus, Epaphras, Justus, Mark, Luke and Demas. None of these persons are mentioned in the Epistle to the Philippians; and he expressly speaks of his having nobody about him, except Timothy, who would care to go to the Philippians. We must agree with Michaelis in taking this passage as a proof that St. Luke was no longer in Rome: the fact of St. Paul not naming him, when he had mentioned him to the Colossians and Philemon, would be sufficient to persuade us of this: but Michaelis well observes, that if St. Luke had been at Rome, St. Paul would never have omitted his name, since he was so well known to the Philippians, by a long residence in their city. It appears also, that Epaphroditus had come to Rome from Philippi subsequent to St. Paul's imprisonment, (ii. 25. iv. 18,) he was there taken ill, (ii. 26,) news of his illness had travelled to Philippi, (ii. 26,) St. Paul was aware of the sensation which it had caused there, (ii. 26,) and Epaphroditus was sufficiently recovered to undertake a journey to Philippi: from all of which we must collect, as Paley has remarked, that the letter could not have been written till St. Paul had been a considerable time in Rome.

Putting all these circumstances together, we are inclined to conclude, that the Epistle to the Philippians was certainly written the last of the four, and a very short time previous to St. Paul's release. Capellus must undoubtedly be wrong, who considered it to have been written the first of the four Epistles. We should also think, that the three others were written late in his confinement, probably in the beginning of the second year, and not earlier, because he speaks of hoping to be released; and it is plain from Col. iv. 10, that time had elapsed for a previous communication to have been made between Rome and Colossæ. We have supposed St. Paul to have arrived at Rome in the spring of 56: and whatever inference we may draw from St. Luke's words, he certainly remained there two *whole* years, *διετίαν ὅλην*, Acts, xxviii.

30. This would bring us to the spring of 58. We know little of what took place in the interval, except that he was allowed to preach the Gospel without any restraint, (Acts, xxviii. 31,) and we have already observed, that the effect of his preaching had reached the prætorium and the emperor's household. There were also many other brethren, who labored in spreading the Gospel at this time in Rome, (Phil. i. 14.) Timothy does not appear to have been with St. Paul, when he first arrived there; but he joined him afterwards, and staid with him to the end of his confinement, (Phil. ii. 19.) We shall show presently that Timothy himself was probably put into prison. Onesimus was converted by St. Paul during this period, (Philemon, 10,) and Epaphras had come to him from Colossæ, (Col. i. 7, 8,) with an account of the state of the Church there, and probably of that at Ephesus also, (Eph. i. 15.) It would appear from Philemon, 23, that Epaphras subsequent to his arrival had been put in prison: from which we must infer that the Christians were not entirely unmolested during this period. St. Paul also speaks of Aristarchus being his fellow-prisoner, (Col. iv. 10.) And though Luke and Aristarchus accompanied St. Paul to Rome, (Acts, xxvii. 2,) they do not appear to have been considered as prisoners; neither does St. Paul speak of St. Luke as being a prisoner, (Col. iv. 14; Philemon, 24,) and if we are right in conjecturing that he was not in Rome, when St. Paul wrote to the Philippians, he must certainly have had his liberty. The imprisonment of Aristarchus therefore must be added to the events which happened in these two years. We have already mentioned, that St. Paul alludes to a previous communication between Rome and Colossæ, (Col. iv. 10,) as well as between Rome and Philippi, (Phil. ii. 25, 26; iv. 18.) Tychicus, Justus, Mark and Demas came to St. Paul during this interval, and as they appear to have left him before he wrote to the Philippians, they probably arrived in 56, or early in 57. We may suppose, that St. Paul wrote the three Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon, early in 58, as soon as the winter was over and Tychicus could undertake the voyage. His own release probably took place in the summer of that year, previous to which he wrote to the Philippians.

Hebrews. A.D. 58.—We have no intention to enter into the many critical questions, which have arisen out of this Epistle, being at present only concerned in fixing its date. There are two passages in it which allude to St. Paul's imprisonment, "Ye had compassion on me in my bonds," (x. 34,) and again, "Pray for us—I beseech you to do this, that I may be restored to you the sooner," (xiii. 18.) But these two passages, particularly the former, may perhaps only show, that St. Paul had been in con-

finement, not that he was so now: they have been understood in this sense by Hug and several other critics, and at all events we may infer, that if St. Paul was not actually released when he wrote this Epistle, he confidently expected to be so. This therefore brings us to about the same period in which the Epistle to the Philippians was written. There is also another passage, which may possibly connect the two Epistles together. St. Paul says to the Philippians, "I hope in the Lord Jesus to send Timothy soon to you," (ii. 19,) and, "Him therefore I hope to send to you," (ii. 23.) In each of these places he expresses a strong hope of being able to send him; but we might infer, that there was some reason why he could not feel certain of doing so. In Heb. xiii. 23. he says, "Know that our brother Timothy is set at liberty, (ἀπολελυμένον,) with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you." Critics have been divided, whether the word ἀπολελυμένον meant that Timothy had been released from prison, or had merely set out from some place, as the Arabic translator understood it. The former is undoubtedly the literal and natural sense: and St. Paul's words would lead us to think that the persons, to whom he was writing, had been aware of Timothy's condition, and were anxious to hear of his release. The reason therefore, why St. Paul could not speak with certainty of sending Timothy to the Philippians, may have been, that Timothy was then in prison; and though St. Paul hoped that he might be released, he could not feel certain of it. If we are right in this conjecture, his own release had taken place between the dates of the Epistles to the Philippians and to the Hebrews; for there can be no doubt, that if Timothy was imprisoned, it was at Rome; and it appears from the above passage, (Heb. xiii. 23,) that St. Paul and Timothy were not then together, though they intended to join each other and proceed to Palestine. Upon this hypothesis, St. Paul had obtained his own release and left Rome before Timothy's fate was finally decided; and the Epistle to the Hebrews was written not from Rome, but from some other place: and from the expression in xiii. 24, "Those of Italy salute you," Michaelis argues that the writer could not at that time have been in Italy, though Hug infers directly the contrary. If St. Paul kept to his intention of sending Timothy to Philippi, it may have been from that place that he now expected Timothy to join him; and he himself was probably in some part of Greece. But he had also expressed an intention to go to Philippi himself, as soon as he was released, (Phil. ii. 24,) so that having been the first to regain his liberty, it is most probable, that instead of sending Timothy to Philippi, he went thither himself; and it was from thence or some other place in Greece that he wrote to the

Hebrews, having first heard from Rome, that Timothy was set at liberty.

It is satisfactory to find, that Michaelis, who did not believe St. Paul to be the author of this Epistle, conceived it to be written about the time which is assigned to his release; so that his opinion as to the date may be said to agree with that of other critics, who have ascribed the Epistle to St. Paul, and thought that he wrote it about the time of his leaving Rome.

2 Timothy. A.D. 64, 65, or 66.—We have already given our reasons for thinking, that this Epistle was written at a later period than those to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians, and during a second imprisonment of St. Paul at Rome. The Apostle alludes in this Epistle to having been lately at Miletus, Troas, and probably at Corinth; and as we then observed, he certainly could not have taken this voyage previous to his first imprisonment. We have therefore supposed him to have taken it in the interval between the two imprisonments; this alone would be sufficient to make us reject the hypothesis, that this Epistle was written while St. Paul was at Rome the first time; though it has been maintained by Baronius, Lightfoot, Hammond, Cave, Lardner, Hug, and others. One argument which has been advanced in support of this notion, is decisive against it. St. Paul having said in 2 Tim. iv. 12, "I have sent Tychicus to Ephesus," it has been assumed, that this was the occasion, on which Tychicus carried the Epistles to Ephesus and Colossæ. But, as Bertholdt has observed, Timothy was at that time with St. Paul at Rome, (Col. 1; Philemon, i. 1,) consequently St. Paul could not have mentioned this mission of Tychicus to Timothy, who was then absent.

We have also alluded to the testimony of Clement, that St. Paul travelled to the extremity of the west: and when we consider the authority of Clement, we feel fully convinced, that such a journey was actually made by St. Paul. Townsend supposes him to have gone on this expedition immediately upon his release from Rome: but we have conjectured above, upon the authority of St. Paul's own words, that he put in execution his firm intention of going as soon as he was released, to Philippi and Colossæ. We have also assumed with Michaelis, that the persons to whom the Epistle to the Hebrews was addressed, lived in Palestine; and the writer expressly says in that Epistle, that he hoped soon to see them, (xiii. 23.) We conclude therefore, that St. Paul went from Rome through Greece and Asia Minor to Jerusalem; and this is precisely the route which he had taken, when he went from Antioch to Corinth in 46, and when he returned from Corinth to Jerusalem in 53. We allow, that the whole of this

journey rests upon conjecture: and our materials for sketching the remainder of the Apostle's life are equally scanty and uncertain.

That he took a journey into the west, we have more than once asserted; and from his twice saying to the Romans, (xv. 24. 28,) that he intended to visit them on his way to Spain, we may reasonably conclude, that he went to that country when he travelled, as Clement says, to the extremity of the west. Subsequent indeed to his writing to the Romans, he had paid them a visit, not as he then hoped and intended, but upon compulsion and in bonds: still, however, there is no reason why he should have abandoned his intention of going to Spain; and until he was called by his heavenly master to receive the crown which awaited him, he would not be likely to consider the debt discharged, which he felt himself to owe to Greeks and Barbarians, (Rom. i. 14.) After he returned from the west, he revisited Asia Minor, and in all probability he saw Jerusalem again before he died. When he came to Rome for the last time, he evidently approached it from the east, having been not long before at Miletus and Troas. This is all that we know of the great Apostle of the Gentiles previous to his last imprisonment. Those persons, who suppose the Epistle to Titus to have been written between the two imprisonments, conceive him to have made a voyage to Crete in this interval, and probably to have passed a winter at Nicopolis: but we have already given our reasons for not acceding to this hypothesis. When St. Paul wrote to Timothy from Rome, he was a prisoner, (i. 8. 12; ii. 9.) His condition also was much worse than on the former occasion: for Onesiphorus had some difficulty in finding out where he was, (i. 17.) There are many traces in the Epistle of a warm persecution having commenced against the Christians. In iv. 16, he speaks of his *first* defence; from which we must infer, that he had either already made a second, or that he expected soon to be called upon to do so. At the time of this first defence his friends had almost all deserted him, (iv. 16.) Demas, Crescens, and Titus had left Rome, (iv. 10,) he himself had sent Tychicus to Ephesus, (12,) and he declares his certain confidence, that the time of his death was drawing near, (iv. 6,) &c. Under these circumstances we can well understand his earnest request to Timothy, three times repeated in this Epistle, that he would come to him soon, and if possible before winter, (i. 4. iv. 9. 21.) Whether his beloved Timothy ever saw him again, or whether his own life was spared till winter, we can never know: but there is every probability, that the martyrdom of St. Paul followed very shortly upon the writing of this Epistle.

The exact date of St. Paul's death has been much contested,

and will probably be for ever contested by chronologists. The traditions of the ancients seem to fix it at the latter end of Nero's reign : for Eusebius and Jerom say, that he suffered in the fourteenth year of Nero, and Epiphanius says that it was in the twelfth. Nero himself died in the fourteenth year of his reign : and since he began to reign in October, 54, we might call either 67 or 68 the fourteenth year of his reign. In the same manner we might call 66 or 67 the twelfth year of his reign ; so that there may have been no actual difference between the statements of Eusebius and Epiphanius ; but each of them may have intended the year 67. Modern writers have been inclined to adopt this date, or one not very remote from it. Baronius places the death of St. Paul in 67, Pearson and Tillemont in 66, Bollandus in 65, and Du Pin in 64. The Neronian persecution began in 64, and almost all writers have considered the death of St. Paul to be connected with that event : nor does this seem at all an improbable hypothesis, coinciding as it does with the ancient tradition. The chief difficulty has arisen from the short time which is allowed between the release of St. Paul from his first imprisonment, and his coming to Rome for the second time ; during which interval there is reason for believing that he did so much. Thus Mosheim, speaking of the persecution in 64, says, that " according to some ancient accounts, Peter and Paul suffered then ; though the latter assertion is contested by many as absolutely irreconcilable with chronology." It would indeed be irreconcilable to those persons, who like Usher, Michaelis, and Hug, brought St. Paul to Rome for the first time in 63 : he would thus be released in 65, a year after the persecution began, and only one or two years before the time fixed by ancient tradition for his death. Even if he was released so late as 63, as Tillemont imagined, the interval would be short for his journies westward and to Asia Minor ; added to which, the Neronian persecution in the west, and the Jewish troubles in the east, (which had already begun,) would make this the most improbable period for these journies to be taken. Dr. Wait, following Bertholdt, pronounces the journey of St. Paul to Spain, Gaul and Britain to be unlikely ; " for sufficient time to visit these countries was not afforded to him before the period of his death."—p. lxxvii. All these difficulties vanish, if we adopt the system of chronology proposed above. If St. Paul came to Rome in 56, and was released in 58, a space of six years would elapse, even if he suffered at the very beginning of the persecution. It appears, however, from his letter to Timothy, that the storm had been raging some time when he wrote it. If he did not die till 66, the probability is, that he did not go to Rome till after the persecution had begun : but when

so few materials are before us for fixing the date of his death, we do not pretend to define it accurately; and can only conclude, that in all probability it happened at some time between the years 64 and 66; and we suppose the second Epistle to Timothy to have been written not long before. Eusebius, though he speaks with certainty (H. E. ii. 22) of St. Paul having made two journeys to Rome, does not state the number of years which intervened: but the ancient Greek preface, which we have already alluded to more than once, refers to this passage of Eusebius, and after quoting some part of it *verbatim*, adds that the Apostle was released and passed ten more years in preaching the Gospel; after which he came again to Rome, and was beheaded in the thirteenth year of Nero, *i. e.* A.D. 66. Having mentioned this ancient preface, we cannot help observing a remarkable agreement between its chronology and our own. It goes on to say, that thirty-five years had elapsed from the conversion of St. Paul to his death; and if we count back thirty-five years from the year 66, we are brought to the year 31, which is precisely that which we have fixed for the conversion of St. Paul. The notion of St. Paul having passed thirty-five years in preaching the Gospel is certainly as old as the time of Chrysostom; and Jerom only differs from these writers by one year, for he says that the Apostle suffered in the fourteenth year of Nero, or the thirty-seventh after the ascension. If the first year in Jerom's calculation was the year which followed the crucifixion, but Chrysostom began with that year itself, there is in fact no difference between them; and a Greek martyrology of the fifth century would agree with both of them, which says that St. Paul suffered in the thirty-sixth year after the crucifixion.

ART. II.—*Ewing's Greek and English Dictionary.* Glasgow; at the University Press. 1827. Third Edition.

THE more we see and the more we read, the more we convince ourselves of the reality of that march of intellect, which we have sometimes heard so unreasonably questioned by the profane. It meets us at every turn, and presents itself under every variety of appearance. We have been instructed by apprentices in the mysticisms of Kant's philosophy; and the last infant that was admitted by our ministry into the Christian congregation, (the daughter of a peasant,) received from her godmothers the Parnassian name of *Urania*. How much farther all this will go, we do not presume to augur; some may think it has already gone far enough: in the mean time we are moved to this pleasing general

conclusion, by a particular feeling of self-abasement, arising from the inspection of the book before us. We remember, with mingled shame and that feeling Virgil hints at in the line ending with *meminisse juvabit*, the years of birchen bondage we passed under the frown of Busby; we remember also, that it took four years to hatch us into Bachelors of Arts; and we have ceased to count the wrinkles, and to pluck out the grey hairs, that have gathered around us, and which appeared, long before we presumed to indulge in that pleasing tone of dictatorial learning which is the tardy fruit of scholarship. Living, however, so remote from those hyperborean regions which Pindar, and sundry other excellent authorities, affirm to be the favourite haunts of Apollo—the *ἱερὰ γέφυρα*—this may not, perhaps, deserve our wonder, though it may excite our regret; and, with a genuine feeling of philanthropy,

“Haud equidem invideo—mirror magis,”

we shall gladly turn our eyes towards every scintillation of those northern lights which illumine and reproach our darkness.

The work before us is a Greek and English Lexicon, originally designed as a Scripture Lexicon only, but by successive improvements and enlargements grown into a general Lexicon. This plan of forming a Lexicon can hardly be successful. Classical Greek can scarcely receive much illustration from the Greek of the Septuagint or New Testament, and cannot afford much more in its turn to those writings, the language of which is as peculiar, as their contents are beyond all comparison important. A Scripture Lexicon, therefore, must be a Scripture Lexicon; and to make the same volume at once explain the Epistles of St. Paul and the orations of Demosthenes, would be a bold undertaking, even if that volume consisted of the folios of Stephens compressed in one, but when it creeps out in the shape of an octavo, the boldness of the attempt becomes more than rashness. “But the book was intended only for beginners,” or, as Mr. Ewing expresses it, such as would in a few months acquire “a competent knowledge of the fundamental parts of the language of the New Testament—without impeding either business which must be attended to, or studies which may be more important”! To such persons a good guide is surely as necessary as to any: according as the light they have is little, so it ought to be perfect; to borrow a homely illustration—a stumbling horse requires the surer hand. We humbly conceive that such as would, by the assistance of Mr. Ewing, at the same time weigh with one hand a pound of candles, and with the other adjust the balances of the Predestinarian controversy, have great need that they should thoroughly understand the terms of that knowledge, into the cri-

tical discussion of which they are about to rush. Physiologists and farmers are equally agreed that the rapidity of its growth is no sure indication of the strength of a tree. "In a few months" Mr. Ewing is confident of teaching the "*fundamental parts*" of the language of the oracles of God: some celebrated lecturers, also emanating from the better illumined North, accomplish this, and more than this, even in a shorter time. We may be permitted, however, in all humility, to entertain a little doubt how far such proficient of a day will experience the truth of Mr. Ewing's prediction, that

"when this" (the knowledge of what he calls, rather obscurely, *the fundamental parts of the language*) "is once attained, the chief difficulty is subdued, subsequent progress will be easy, and every step smoothed by the satisfaction of examining *in* (?) increased facility, the oracles of God, in the language in which they were delivered to men."

We are, indeed, bound to believe that such paradoxical miracles are sometimes wrought; for Mr. Ewing assures us that some persons who used his former editions, "by that assistance alone became acquainted with the New Testament." After having thus experienced the success of his former editions, Mr. Ewing adopted the praiseworthy plan of interleaving (as he informs us) one of them; and thanks to this novel device, and the "*valuable assistance of Christian friends*," he completed the present work, "and has," he continues, "now to acknowledge the kindness of Divine Providence in permitting him to accomplish it."

We admire his piety, and do not stop to criticise the expression of it; we very much doubt, nevertheless, how far these *optimi quidem sed non doctissimi viri*, will add to the stores of biblical learning, even under the guidance of such principles and rules as these:—"In studying Greek, as well as any other foreign language, the forms, powers and distinctions of the *letters* must first be attended to"! a great discovery for any Neophyte, who for the first time in his life has looked into the black abyss of a Greek Lexicon, and beheld the chaos of its Ξ 's and X's and Θ 's, κ . τ . λ .! By and by, however, we may conceive the day to be dawning sparingly upon him; and accordingly another mystery is revealed:

"In English we say—*of, to, for, with a man; can, may, shall, will* STRIKE: in Greek we express all these by certain alterations *on* (?) the words signifying *man* and *strike*."

There is not, it is true, much novelty in all this, (except that alterations *on* the words is not quite English, but probably may be so at Glasgow;) and it is equally true that the practice, as well as the principle, of these rules is known to every child who has got as far as $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omega$, by dint of a Greek accident, and the occasional exemplification in his own person of its *passive sense*.

The impatient curiosity of a Sicilian tyrant would not wait to learn the elements of the science he wished to possess, but expected to have the secrets of mathematics as much at his service as the pockets of his subjects; but if Hiero could not command a royal road to the mathematics, with Archimedes at his elbow, much less, we fear, shall those amiable men find their expectations realized, who expect to read, or to compose, Lexicons and Grammars, which, in three months, shall do the work of three years of Scapula or Stephens. Those who have climbed the highest, know best the labour of climbing the steep, and somewhat barren, heights of ancient literature; and those who have been the longest practised, are the slowest to decide in the more serious questions of Biblical criticism. Much is doubtless gained *by the way* in every laudable or innocent pursuit; far more in the careful perusal of Holy Writ, much must be gained, by an attentive mind, more than the immediate object of its pursuit—the language and phraseology; all we would deprecate is unreasonableness of expectation, sure to be followed by proportionate disappointment.

The purport of the above will be forgiven by those who duly consider the importance of the means and the mode of learning, in the case of so difficult a language as the Greek; a work especially, which makes its appearance from an University press, is the legitimate object of—challenges and demands—a double dose of critical regard. We shall proceed to examine a little more minutely some particulars, (mostly taken at hazard,) with as much attention as we may, and with infinite good will towards any one who has undertaken the ungrateful task of composing a Lexicon.

The Lexicon is preceded by a Grammar, our principal objection to which is the introduction of some rules, apparently meant to simplify, what are incapable of correct simplification (in any great degree), the peculiarities of Greek construction. *Brevi esse laboro* is a laudable rule, but seldom comes without the qualifying consequence *obscurus fio*. We do not wish to uphold the school-books of Eton or Westminster as oracles of philosophical Grammar; but we much doubt whether those antiquated, quaint, and unmethodical rules in Latin, which it cost our childhood so many tears to learn, are not more effectual leading-strings to the beginner in Greek, than such general principles as the following:

“ When, after an active verb, there is expressed not only the subject of the action, but likewise some particular circumstance necessarily connected therewith, the verb, in such cases, besides the noun signifying the subject, is followed likewise by a second noun denoting the circumstance, and the last governed by the verb, in one or other of the following modes: When in English, the two nouns thus following the verb, are connected

by the preposition *of* or *from*, the second noun in Greek, is put in the genitive," &c.—p. 92.

Thus, (if we understand the rule as so stated,) in such constructions as *παίω αὐτὸν σκῆπτρῳ*—*σκῆπτρῳ* is the circumstance;—*ἔπεμπον αὐτὸν νῆϊ*—*νῆϊ* again is the circumstance; and so it may be, if the word "circumstance" has a right to all this extensive property of signification on the other side the Tweed. All we mean to doubt is, whether the rule will materially help the learner, by guiding him through the labyrinth of Greek constructions, in the original authors; or assisting him in the arduous task of imitating them. And what is meant by "a circumstance necessarily connected therewith?" We leave this for others to answer:—" *Davi sumus non Œdipodes.*"

Again, in the more particular rule that follows upon the general one, we are told that of the two nouns thus following the verb, when in English connected by the preposition *of* or *from*, the second noun in Greek is put in the genitive. As far as we can catch the light of this rule, we conceive we are exemplifying it in such a case as *ἔπεμπον αὐτὸν Ἀθηνῶν*—I sent him *from* Athens; yet such a construction would certainly have made

Quintilian stare and gasp."

We pass on, merely observing that these rules may be excellent in their way; but they very often happens unluckily not to be the right one. They may do very well to guide the Hamiltonian proficient, with one eye on the Greek, and another reclining on the English below; or they may amuse the antiquity, the full-grown *abece-darian*, who consults the New Testament by the light of our despised Translation; but they can hardly be very efficient in that which the author professes,—viz. guiding the well-meaning student through the intricacies of Biblical reading in the original tongue. Under the head of prepositions we have an account of *ὑπό*; which, considering that full-grown thumbers of the Accidence appear specially the objects of Mr. Ewing's provident care, who are desirous of overleaping the bounds of space and time in their advances, is a little liable, we conceive, to the old objection, that "the Interpreter is the harder of the two." "The primary meaning of *ὑπό* appears to have been *high*, whence its significations as a preposition."

(*εὖ νῆ τὸν Ερμῆν, ὅ, τι λέγεις ὃ οὐ μανθάνω.*)

A note, however, adds the climax to this elucidation, proving that *high* and *low* are just the same; that the ideas are *relative*, and therefore *indifferent*. Thus "*ἄγκος ὑπὸ ὄρεος* 'a valley so situated that the mountain is high in reference to it.' In English it is done in the second mode; 'a valley under a mountain,' the

idea is the same, only the turn of the phrase different." So Mr. E. This is the old and excellent Socratic mode of reasoning, according to Aristophanes; and the same metaphysical juggling, is equally good in all climates and ages:

"τίς οἶδεν εἰ τὸ ζῆν μὲν ἐστὶ καθαρεῖν,
τὸ πνεῖν δὲ δεῖπνεῖν, καὶ τὸ καθεύδειν κώδιον;"

We certainly can give no other reason against either supposition than the *fact*: ὑπὸ signifies *under*; of the derivations of Greek prepositions we know so little, we are slow to adopt any, (certainly not that proposed in this instance by Mr. Ewing,) and we humbly conceive that the adult beginners in Greek, who ought to have been *under* the rod of some sound Aristarchus in their days of puerility, will gain little by being thus grammatically taught to think themselves *above* it.

Glancing our eyes over these same prepositions, we observe ἀντὶ—supplied with a sense and an example of a sense as follows: ἀντὶ ἀνδρὸς ἴτω, *go against the man*. When Mr. Ewing reconsiders this piece of composition, if he call in so humble an auxiliary as Scapula or the Eton grammar, he will be surprised to find, perhaps, that of the four words of his translation three are wrong, and the fourth could not help being right. The spirit of etymologizing is so seductive, that we cannot wonder Mr. Ewing and his authorities should occasionally be led by it a little out of the way. We no more believe, with Mr. Ewing, that Ajax owed his name to the appearance of an eagle, (αἰετός,) when Hercules chose to invest the young hero in his Nemean skin, notwithstanding all that may be alleged in behalf of such an etymology, than we believe (though Pindar, who gives occasion to the fable* about Ajax, tells us so) that Iamus and all his posterity got their name from the violets among which the founder lay concealed; or than we lend an ear to those sturdy Celtic antiquaries who tell us, (with a thousand things equally authentic,) that the old Scythian philosopher (and *charlatan*) Herodotus talks of, Abaris, was in fact a Welchman, and his true name,—incommodious to Grecian lips,—*Ap-Rees*. Mr. Ewing, however, goes a step farther than this, for he gravely tells us, that ἄις is a participle, making, or which ought to make, the neuter ἄιν; and this participle, we presume, derived from the verb αἰετός. This is really information, and whether from Scotland or Germany, gladly to be hailed and worthily acknowledged. ἄις, then, is a participle, signifying "announced by an eagle;" and Swift's attempt (not so *decorous*, but as *probable*) at etymologizing his name must be surrendered. Supposing, however, that the name came ever so much from αἰετός, Ajax

* See Isthm. vi. 78.

would no more be a participle than *Fabius* or *Cicero*, and ten thousand more names unquestionably derived from substantives, or than any other name the reader may choose to think of. Before we finally closed the grammatical part of the book, we indulged ourselves with a peep into the article on prosody. In which (we do not profess to have collected *all*) the following little particularities present themselves, “*ut pulchro in corpore navi.*”

“*ἡμιν* and *ὑμιν*,” are indeed, as they are set down, long enough; but everybody also knows, that they frequently have the last short, the accent being changed accordingly.

“*ῥογῆς*” is marked long in the ultimate—and so it is, generally, in some authors; but the same word (when belonging, perhaps, to a different declension) is also short, and in other authors generally so. See (quoted by Maltby) *Ant.* 1021; and *Herc. Fur.* 974.

“*τις*,” indef.: stated to be common. Glad news this for beginners in Greek verse; such “young adventurers,” however, should have been warned, before they plead the authority of Homer, that

“*Nobis non licet esse tam disertis,*”

“*χαῖος*,” meant, we suppose, for *χαῖος*, “good,”—a provincial word, rarely occurring; the accent, at least, should have been added, to distinguish it from *χάος*, which is as short as an Inceptor in Divinity’s sermon.

“*Ἀξῦλος*,” i. e. the proper name (the name of a man, mentioned in Homer only as killed): let not the incautious reader fail to observe the *capital letter*, and think (as well he may) that the adjective is meant.

“*συν*, in composition, is sometimes made long, as *σύνημι*.” It would have been but courtesy to have added an example.

To these must be added—

“*τᾶγος* and *τᾶγη*,” are thus marked as long, and so they both are, *sometimes*; but they are also both *sometimes* short; and the last almost always so.

“*φῦταω* and *φῦτευω*,” are also thus marked and placed, the latter not very properly—*Τοιγὰρ φῦτεύων παῖδας κ. τ. λ.* Every body knows this.

We have but cursorily examined the rest: every allowance ought certainly to be made for that which all who cause Greek to be printed must have experienced, the unaccountable obstinacy of ordinary workmen in letting slip no reasonable occasion of making a blunder. More particularly this is to be seen in the printing of those little talismanic signs denoting *long* and *short*. In the disposition of the dictionary part, we observe that the words *βάμμα*, *βαπτίζω*, and their derivatives, occupy the best part of

eighteen columns of an octavo volume. The cause of this ample accumulation of matter on no very difficult words, doubtless was, the primary design of the work to serve as a Scripture lexicon; but now that the Scripture lexicon has been adapted, according to the title page, to the Greek classics, it would perhaps have been better to have restored to the original owners some of the learning which had been borrowed from them, and to have made room for ἀλέης, which does not occur, (perhaps because it does not occur in the index of the Glasgow Scapula,) ὑπηρέσιον, and a few other heathenish words of some difficulty, (though certainly not many,) which we have been unable to find. We confess that the alphabetical arrangement Mr. Ewing has adopted appears to us infinitely more wise, than the mysterious circuit by which the learner is for the most part compelled to ascend the very first steps of Greek literature. The student who has just been emancipated from the pains and penalties of learning his syntax by heart, and begins to grope his way in Sophocles or Euripides, if he possess sufficient discernment to feel what an impotent auxiliary he brought with him from school in his Hederic or Schrevelius, buys a Scapula; and soon discovers that an acquaintance is not to be formed with this new ally, but by infinite trouble to his juvenile head and fingers. He has to follow up the most ordinary words to the most extraordinary originals, from which the caprice of the lexicographer, ancient or modern, may have thought fit to deduce them;—and what sort of etymologists they were, any one may convince himself by opening any page of any Greek lexicon. But we are wandering from Mr. Ewing, whose arrangement is obviously more simple, and does not, by assuming to be philosophical, (*necessarily*) plunge him into such old scholastic derivations, as that ἀλάσως comes from λήθω, and πρέσβυς—ἀπὸ τοῦ περισσῶς βεβιωκέναι. For the most part, the explanations Mr. Ewing gives are adequate and correct. We have freely remarked upon a few points, of no very great consequence after all; and, in the same spirit, we beg to call his attention to the following two or three words, which, in looking hastily over the work, struck us as wanting a better explanation:

“ἀντάω” does not come from ἀντί, (ἀντιάω and ἀντιάζω, ditto) but from ἄντα; just as good a preposition, as long as it was in use.

“λαλέαγρα, perhaps from ἄλυσις and ἄγρα”—

(ὧ σοφωτάτη φύσις,
ταυτὶ πότερ' αὐτὸς εὖρες ἢ Κηφισοφῶν;)

from whatever source this piece of etymology may proceed, we wonder how the word following next in Mr. Ewing's column did not teach him a better derivation.

“*κημὸς*” wants the only explanation (carefully given by Pollux) necessary to a reader of Aristophanes.

“*κλιτύς*—a declivity:” apply this to Eur. Hipp. 226, and Cycl. 50.

“*παρὰλλάγη*.” Appended to this word is a passage from St. James, i. 17, with Bishop Jebb's translation of it, which, whatever be its merit, is too questionable for a general lexicon.*

“*παρῳόρος*” is thus explained: “(from *παράειρω*,) led by the side of, tied at the side, hanging at the side, stretched out near; loose, disorderly, plunging; insane, foolish.” It would have been better to have made all this clear, and all these hard words consistent, by first stating *what* it is that is properly said to be “led by the side of, tied at the side, plunging,” &c.; and then, perhaps, the learner might have seen a little into the meaning of the *ἄχρεϊον καὶ παρῳόρον δέμας* of Æschylus, very difficult to be construed according to the above explanation.

“*ποικιλόσολος*” does certainly signify “having a variegated dress,” but it signifies something more; otherwise Sophocles used the word a little absurdly in his Phil. i. 343, where the student would need another lexicon to tell him that it means also “having a painted prow.” For the same reason, *Στόλος* demands another signification, in addition to those assigned it, if the lexicographer would enable the learner to construe Æschylus, Pers. 414, and other places.

“*ἀμφιβάλλω*.” We quote this word because it contains an instance, of which there are several, of Mr. Ewing's persevering love of Cowper, and Cowper's Homer,

“*κρατερὸν μένος ἀμφιβαλόντες*.”—Il. P. 742.

“And as two mules *with emulous efforts* draw.”—Cowper,

who adds, in a note, “It is observed of oxen, that they draw equally, and are contented to take each his due share of the labour, but that mules are emulous of each other, and contend which shall toil the most; so that sometimes one will draw the whole weight, and sometimes the other.” This, with many other quotations from the same amiable poet, might have been spared. What the Homeric mules might have done we do not pretend to say; certainly the modern *hybrids* cannot be accused of any such disposition to emulous exertion. The old interpreters, for the most part, are more simple in their explanation of the passage.

The word “*Ἀεπτος*” also requires some revision, inasmuch as the *young of lions*, of whom the poet who uses the word was

* The translation in question is the property of Gilbert Wakefield, and too wild to be quoted.

speaking, are not very apt to fly, except in a metaphorical and ungrammatical sense. The word is a hard word, and has puzzled others.

Mr. Ewing must be entreated to receive the above remarks with candour. From its size, cheapness, and laudable brevity, (in most respects,) his book is capable of becoming generally useful; a little more trouble on his part may render it so.

ART. III.—*The Nature and Extent of the Christian Dispensation, with reference to the Salvability of the Heathen.* By Edward William Grinfield, M.A. 8vo. London. Rivingtons. 1827. pp. 461. 12s.

WE have in this work a notable exemplification of the injury which may sometimes be inflicted on a good cause by the exertions of an indiscreet and vehemently zealous advocate. The passionate earnestness with which the author has addressed himself to this disquisition may be sufficiently collected from the language of his Preface. He there avows that "the extreme delicacy as well as magnitude of the argument caused him frequently to lay it aside;" till, at last, the immense importance of the subject overpowered all apprehensions of difficulty. "The consequent conviction of his own duty" seems to have become like to a burning fire shut up in his bones, so that he was weary of forbearing, and could stay no longer. The impatient element has now burst forth, and finds fuel in almost every thing that crosses it in its course!

That the question which he proposes to discuss is one of tremendous interest, no humane or thoughtful person will ever be found to deny. It is impossible for any one to reflect on the fact that, at this moment, not much more than one-fifth of the human race professes the religion of Christ, without deep and anxious *searchings of heart* as to the eternal destinies of the remainder. The earth is supposed to be peopled with 800 millions of human beings; of whom, in round numbers, it is calculated that 480 millions are Pagans, 140 millions Mahometans, about three millions, at the utmost, Jews, the remainder consisting of Christians of every denomination. On surveying this formidable table, the inquiry naturally and irresistibly suggests itself, what is to be the fate of those innumerable multitudes who have never heard the name of the Redeemer; or, who have heard it only as a name of reproach, an appellation fitted to excite no other feelings than those of contempt and abhorrence? The Christian Dispensation is the only remedy for the disorder and ruin brought into the

world by the disobedience of the First Pair. What then is to become of those to whom this remedy is unknown; who never have been invited to accept and to apply it; or who have, from their earliest childhood, been taught to scorn and loathe it as a despicable imposture? Are we to believe that the benefits of this gracious economy are confined to those who are brought under its influence as a revelation? or, is there good reason to presume that its blessings have been and are extended to ignorant and unconscious millions, in every age, before and since its promulgation?

The opinions which have been entertained by divines on this subject may be reduced to four; of which we may place, as the first and narrowest, that of the Calvinists, who maintain that the scheme of salvation is limited and partial, not only in its effect, but in its design; and who confine the benefits of redemption, actual and intended, to the elect of God; to the utter exclusion of all others, whether they be members of Christ's visible church or not. This gloomy persuasion, so far as relates to the present question, is very distinctly expressed in the following ruthless passage from Bishop Beveridge, which Mr. Grinfield has chosen for one of his mottos:—

“Firmly believe, and doubt not at all, that not only all Pagans, but also all Jews, Heretics and Schismatics, who end the present life without the Catholic Church, shall go into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels.”—*Bishop Beveridge, on the XVIIIth Article.*

Secondly stands the opinion of those who maintain that the Christian redemption is in this sense universal, namely, that its blessings are open to persons of every tribe and nation, without distinction, who may be invited and disposed to embrace it; and that, in the course of ages, the knowledge of it will be spread over the earth, and Christianity become the religion of all mankind. In another sense, however, they hold that the dispensation is partial; namely, that, in effect, its benefits are strictly limited to those who are actually admitted within the pale of the Christian church. This scheme is termed by Mr. Grinfield *Ecclesiastical Calvinism*, as opposed to the *popular Calvinism* of the present age, (p. 202.)

Thirdly we have the views of those who just admit the *possibility*, that the heathen may be capable of salvation, through the merits and intercession of a Saviour whom they have never known or received; but who decline to speak confidently on a matter, respecting which they conceive the language of Scripture to be ambiguous and obscure.

Fourthly may be classed the divines, who hesitate not to affirm, (though not all with the same degree of confidence,) that the knowledge of the Gospel is not *necessary* to the accomplishment of God's merciful purposes; and that Christianity, though partial as a revelation, is yet, as an economy of grace, universal. These sentiments are briefly conveyed in the language of Bishop Butler, which Mr. Grinfield has introduced into his title page, by way of bringing out, in more terrible *relief*, the merciless dogma of St. Augustine, as adopted and expressed by Bishop Beveridge: "*It cannot be imagined* that none can have the benefit of the general redemption, but those who have been made acquainted with it in the present life." To these may now be added:

Fifthly, the *determination* of Mr. Grinfield, who, not content with the admission that the salvability of the heathen is possible, or with the assertion that it is, on every account, in the highest degree probable, pronounces it to be absolutely certain; affirms that it is as fairly and plainly deducible from Scripture as almost any other point of Christian doctrine; and disdains to accept from fathers and doctors, merely as an object of hope, that which patriarchs, and prophets, and apostles, have tendered to him as an article of *faith*.

With regard to the first of all these opinions, we entirely agree with the author, that they who adopt it are in possession of one clear advantage over those who profess the doctrine of Universal Redemption, and yet confine redemption wholly within the pale of Christendom;—namely, that their scheme is throughout consistent with itself. If any one should ask—how can it be believed that the Author of our faith could *design* its blessings only for a select and favoured number, out of the multitudes which constitute His visible Church; he may be asked in return—how he is able to endure the notion, that the same gracious Being can shut the gates of mercy upon that vast portion of the human race, who have had no opportunity of accepting or rejecting His offers of salvation? The Calvinist is secure from the molestation of this very inconvenient question. He is perfectly invulnerable against the charge of inconsistency and contradiction. He is armed with the triple brass of a strong persuasion, that all difficulties may by us be safely and comfortably resolved into the sovereignty of God; and that it is for Him to gather His peculiar people from out of the condemned and perishing mass of mankind, by whatsoever method or process may seem best to His infinite wisdom. Here are no relentings, no "compunctious visitings," to relax or vary the adamantine physiognomy of his system. Whereas the patron of *universal* redemption *within* the Church, is compelled, as it

were, to look stern and awful with one moiety of his visage, while he affects a mild and amiable aspect with the other!

Mr. Grinfield, therefore, is perfectly right in his assertion that Calvinism is a scheme of prodigious compactness and symmetry. To the eye, however, which is accustomed to more catholic and charitable views, its symmetry will very much resemble that of a yew tree, clipped and shorn into the likeness of geometrical figures, as compared with the graceful and picturesque irregularity of form, which distinguishes the wild but majestic children of the forest; a symmetry obtained precisely by the sacrifice and amputation of everything which could make it an object that the eye can rest upon with delight; a symmetry which makes it as dissimilar as possible to what we should naturally expect to come forth from the hand of the faithful and merciful Creator! Its proportions are indeed exact. It is something *omnibus numeris absolutum*. It is a form, however, with a hard and iron outline; and without the slightest approach to that softness and flexibility which is one of the chiefest attributes of beauty. Such, indeed, is its unloveliness, that exaggeration or misconception were not required to render it more repulsive. We were, therefore, concerned to find Mr. Grinfield asserting, that, according to this system, the Divine government proceeds *solely* on the maxim,—“*Sic volo, sic jubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas.*” Now this is a misrepresentation. No well-informed Calvinist ever maintains that, in the Divine counsels, the arbitrary will of the Almighty stands *in the place of* right or reason. On the contrary, he affirms, that however arbitrary and despotic the purposes of God may appear to us, they are, in truth, founded on the purest equity and righteousness; and that, at the great day, the justice of all His proceedings will be made abundantly manifest to the universe. The present imperfection of our faculties (he insists) would, probably, disable us for clearly comprehending all the motives and reasons which actuate the Supreme Intelligence in His dealings with mankind, even if He were pleased to disclose them to us. He, therefore, in many instances, wisely and graciously veils them from our eyes in total concealment, and refers us directly to His own mysterious sovereignty. In such cases, if ever His decrees are termed arbitrary, it is, not because they are capricious, and independent of all reasonable motive, but purely because the motive is, and will remain, unknown to us, until we are able to understand, and He is willing to reveal it. Until that period shall arrive, His language to us must be,—*I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy; and whom I will I harden*: in other words,—My dispensations, either of goodness or severity, are regulated by

views and principles which are, at present, hidden from mortal eyes.—The sons of men must, therefore, be content to rest in my decisions, as issuing from my Supreme will, which they neither can resist nor fully understand.

We have thought it advisable to offer these remarks and explanations, because the interests of sound theology never can be advanced by a misrepresentation of the various errors opposed to it. It is greatly to be lamented that Calvinism has sometimes been attacked by persons who have neither understood its weakness nor its strength; and the consequence has been, that their resources have occasionally been wasted on its unassailable points, while its indefensible quarters have wholly escaped assault. Of the former mistake we have an instance before us in this assertion of Mr. Grinfield, that, according to the Calvinistic scheme, the secret decrees of God are arbitrary *in the strictest sense*. We, therefore, once more remind him, that when this class of religionists speak of the Divine purposes as arbitrary and irrespective, they usually mean no more than this;—that the reasons on which they are founded are concealed from man, and that we know nothing of them, but that they proceed from the Supreme mind: and when, with their founder, they confess the sentence of reprobation to be *horrible*, they intend to express, that it is in violent opposition to our views and feelings, seeing, as we now do, only in part. But we doubt not that the most enlightened and sober-minded among them are supported by the persuasion, that a day will come, which will show the severest decrees of God to be equally adorable both for righteousness and mercy.

On the supposition, then, that the Scriptures do not contradict him, this position of the Calvinist is not assailable by the vulgar objection here hurled at him by this antagonist. He does but put into the mouth of the Deity, language which might be used, (though, of course, with infinitely less authority and justice,) even by a wise and benevolent human autocrat, to subjects too barbarous or ignorant to comprehend enlightened and profound principles of government. He might fairly say to them,—*sic volo, sic jubeo*; my edicts may appear harsh and unreasonable, but I have grounds for them which it would be impossible for you to comprehend: to you, therefore, my will must, for the present, be the only motive for obedience; *stat pro ratione voluntas*. The time, however, will doubtless arrive, when you will fully perceive and gratefully acknowledge the usefulness and the justice of all my sternest proceedings and designs.

The mischief, however, lies here; that the impulse communicated by this system of belief, is often so violent as to carry poor

and feeble minds into fantastic and dangerous extremities. It is probable, that many a believer who begins by a humble and simple acquiescence in the inscrutable decree of God, is brought at last positively to exult in the contemplation of its effects. He fancies that he is already able to perceive *how* the final and eternal rejection of countless millions is made subservient to the glory, not only of the Divine righteousness, but of the Divine mercy and goodness! He is thus enabled to think, with actual complacency, on the hopeless misery of multitudes of his fellow-creatures. On the other hand, it sometimes happens, that when this system is fairly brought into collision with minds endowed with a strong principle of resistance to whatever is contrary to the common sense and feelings of mankind, they recoil from it with a force that carries them to fearful lengths in the opposite direction. And hence it is that both individuals and communities have commenced in the highest regions of the Supralapsarian scheme, and have descended at last into the depths of a theology, *unstable as water*, and scarcely deserving the appellation of Christian.

We take this opportunity of adverting to another mistake, which may be said to pervade, and to be almost omnipresent in the disquisitions of Mr. Grinfield; and which, it must be confessed, emerges frequently in the writings of many eminent divines, who have reasoned on the question of universal redemption. He is perpetually raising an outcry against the frightful impiety of supposing, that a just and gracious God will punish millions of men, for their ignorance of a Redeemer, whom they had no means of knowing and receiving! Now we believe it may be very safely affirmed, (notwithstanding the loose unguarded language which may have too often dropped from theological writers,) that no system of divinity can be named which gravely and deliberately maintains any such position. We doubt whether the sal-lowest Supralapsarian, in his most atrabilious mood, ever dreams that ignorance of Christ, or want of faith in his mediation, will be among the sins laid to the charge of the heathen at the day of judgment. He would, most probably, agree with the author of this Treatise, that there are multitudes of pagans, respecting whom neither belief nor unbelief can be intelligibly predicated. They are, properly speaking, no more believers or unbelievers, than the Esquimaux are partizans or adversaries of the differential analysis. It is true, the Calvinist holds that nothing but *indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish*, is reserved for the heathen, without exception, and to all eternity. But then, it never enters his head, that want of acquaintance with the way of redemption can, with any propriety, be considered as the *cause* of

their sufferings. He conceives (whether justly or unjustly) that they will be doomed to misery, because the sin of Adam brought upon mankind a curse, which, so far as they are concerned, has never been reversed; and because they have merited perdition by their own multiplied breaches of the divine law. But no man in his senses ever imagines that the Righteous Judge will set down, among the grounds of their condemnation, the circumstance of their being, from their birth, aliens from the commonwealth of the faithful. To assert this would be just about as reasonable as to affirm that mankind perished at the Deluge, *because* they did not, or could not, get into the Ark! This, however, is an absurdity with which the Calvinistic system, among its heavy and manifold demerits, certainly cannot, with any truth, be charged.

The above consideration is far from unimportant to those who would fix their convictions, respecting this interesting subject, on reasonable and substantial foundations. The doctrine, that redemption looks not beyond the boundaries of the Church, is, in truth, sufficiently appalling. But they who reject it should, at least, distinctly possess themselves of the legitimate reasons for so doing. And it may be very confidently affirmed, that if all objections to it were as baseless as that to which we have just adverted, the doctrine would remain for ever impregnable.

Another favourite resource of the author is a passionate appeal to the universal benevolence and perfect righteousness of the Deity; attributes, which are outraged by the presumption, that his dispensations of grace can possibly have a limited and partial aspect. We are repeatedly told that a revelation, which proceeds from God, must *necessarily* be universal: that to affirm the contrary is almost to maintain a positive contradiction. Nay, we are solemnly warned, that by admitting a doubt as to the universality of redemption, we, in effect, bring into question the divinity of Christ, who, being the Maker of all things, must be the Saviour of all men; that we make a breach in the fortress of our faith, through which Socinians, and infidels, and scorners may find an entrance, and may thus be enabled to shake the whole fabric into ruins.

It is extremely painful to be compelled to follow any writer into these regions of dangerous speculation. We very much doubt whether they, "who are highest in the scale of being," ever venture to pronounce, with the rash confidence of this author, what is, and what is not, consistent with the attributes of the Deity. One would imagine, that before any mortal dared to leap into the crater of these awful metaphysics, he would inquire

whether the powers and capacities of man are such as qualify him to live and move in the midst of such mysterious elements. The philosophy of this examiner appears to be embarrassed by no such "saucy doubts and fears." We, therefore, feel it quite necessary to suggest certain considerations, by way of caution, to those who might otherwise be impelled to follow him to the extent of his presumptuous reasonings.

In the first place, then, we conceive, that the perfect goodness of the Deity is a principle, or axiom, to be held sacred and inviolable, in all our disquisitions relative to the ways of his Providence; a principle never, on any account, to be considered as questionable. We are disposed to regard the Being of God, with all his glorious attributes, as an absolute, primitive, and (if we may so express it) aboriginal verity, written on the tablets of every human heart; though the characters will be more or less legible, in proportion as the moral and intellectual powers are more or less happily developed by circumstances and by education. To believe the moral nature of the Supreme Being imperfect, is to inflict insupportable violence on our nature. The notion that our senses are deceitful, and that we live in a world of dreams and mockery, is not half so intolerable as the surmise, that the Sovereign of the Universe can have one particle of evil in his essence. In short, the credence which the generality of mankind give to their eyes and ears is not more complete than that which every sound mind gives to the oracle within, when it tells us, that the Deity is perfectly and absolutely good! And as this is a principle which mere argument is incompetent to establish, so, on the other hand, is it independent of all reasonings, or facts, or appearances, which ever can be employed to shake it.

But, further, if the very nature and constitution of man assures him of the goodness of his Maker, the history and the condition of man assures him of the fact, that evil exists, to a tremendous extent, in the creation, which is the work of His hand. The two propositions are equally certain, and perfectly independent. However incompatible they may appear to us, it is impossible that they can, in reality, be contradictory of each other. Whatever, therefore, may be this quality of perfect benevolence, one thing is quite evident—that it is a quality not inconsistent with the actual existence of a vast amount of wretchedness. The dreadful and widely extended suffering which meets us in every direction, has, indeed, betrayed many into doubts of the existence of any moral attributes at all, in the Sovereign Intelligence. But no man, unless his moral perceptions and capacities have been dreadfully depraved, suffers himself to conjecture that, if there be

such a thing as divine goodness, that goodness can be partial only.

What, then, is the lesson to be learned from this Great Paradox that is constantly before our eyes?—Is it not clearly this?—That we reverently abstain from pronouncing what degree of evil, or of misery, is inconsistent with the supreme benevolence, that we distrust the suggestions of our understandings, when they tempt us to conclude, that this or that view of the divine dispensations *must* be false, because it is incompatible with the loving-kindness of God. If the confusion and anguish which we actually witness be not contradictory of His mercy, how can we confidently prescribe the quantity, and degree, and duration of evil, which shall be held to be destructive of that blessed attribute. *A priori*, perhaps, (we speak it with all humility and reverence,) we might be impelled to pronounce it impossible that such a world as this should have issued from the hand of a Being, perfect in wisdom, power, and benevolence. As it is, however, we know that such an inference would be utterly erroneous. How, then, can any human being presume to affirm, that God cannot be the author of anything so apparently replete with severity as the system of partial redemption? How can we venture confidently to reason from the attributes of the Deity, as to the extent of evil which it may be consistent with His goodness to admit into His final adjustment of the destinies of the human race?

Precisely a similar train of observation is applicable to the righteousness of the Deity. On our right hand stands the certainty of His unalterable justice. On our left are assembled a multitude of phenomena, which we, in our present dimness and infirmity, are compelled to refer directly to His omnipotence and sovereignty alone. We know that it hath been His pleasure to bring millions of reasonable creatures into existence; to place them, without their own consent, in a state of formidable probation; to give them natures which cannot move towards their perfection, but through a course of painful and fiery discipline—of discipline, too, which He himself distinctly foresees, must, in a multitude of instances, fatally and entirely fail of its effect upon the individuals exposed to it. All this we know; and all this is more than, by any process of mere argument, we can fully reconcile to any notions we are enabled to form of the attribute of equity or justice. And yet, certain as all this is, it is not a whit more certain, than that the Deity is essentially, and, as it were, by the very necessity of His nature, absolutely and perfectly just. Here, then, we ask, once more, what is the moral to be derived from the contemplation of these equally certain, but seemingly

adverse and conflicting truths? Is it not clearly and obviously this? That we forbear to mark out, by metes and bounds, a certain space, and then to say, that, beyond these limits, Omnipotence itself can never stray, without walking in *ways that are unequal*—that we hesitate to reject a peculiar scheme of interpretation, merely because it offers aggression to our crude and imperfect notions of right. We are, even in this world, surrounded by appearances which are utterly inexplicable, upon any principles of reasoning which our present capacities place within our reach. How, then, can any mortal pronounce that the belief in certain severe proceedings and awards, to take place in the next world, is absolutely to be rejected, as inconsistent with the Supreme and Eternal Justice? Is it possible that any human being can reason thus, without starting at his own temerity and presumption?

Which, then, we would demand—(and we recommend the question to the serious consideration of the author before us, and of all his readers)—which is the more becoming, the more reverent, and the more pious way of conducting an inquiry, which, like the present, involves the inscrutable attributes of God? That which rushes at once to the conclusion, that the doctrine of limited redemption *must* inevitably be false, because it ascribes to the Deity proceedings inconsistent with His nature, and that an angel* should not be received if he came to preach it; or that which takes a more circumspect and modest course—which first labours to establish that the scheme of universal redemption harmonizes, better than the opposite system, with all our views and notions of equity, with all the affections of our hearts and dictates of our understandings, and, above all, with the *general* declarations of Scripture; and then infers, that we may indulge a reasonable and confident hope of its truth. One really would imagine, to hear the course of this author's reasoning and observation, that he had constantly before his eyes a distinct and faithful image and representation of the divine perfections; that he was gifted with a capacity which never yet belonged to the children of men—the capacity of looking upon the splendours of the Divine Majesty without oppression or confusion; and that, with this supreme and original perfection incessantly present to his mind, he was able to decide, infallibly, what particular features of any system or doctrine were abhorrent from the dignity and beauty of that faultless pattern. For ourselves, we are content to keep in remembrance the saying, “that they who approach, too nearly, the Light, which is the dwelling-place of Omnipotence, will assuredly

* Page 242.

be struck down and overpowered by its glory;" and we heartily commend the same caution to all persons, whose inquiries lead them near to the confines of God's hidden and mysterious Providence.

The complexion of the author's thoughts upon the subject of his inquiry is still farther illustrated by his indignant and contemptuous treatment of the distinction, so long familiar to divines, between the covenanted and uncovenanted mercies of God. He maintains that uncovenanted mercies are no mercies at all; and that to admit the notion of them into Divinity, is virtually to abandon the cause of universal redemption without a struggle, and to surrender it at discretion to Calvinism, its bitterest adversary! We are quite unable to perceive any good reason for this turbulent rejection of a surmise, which has had the sanction of many of the greatest names in Theology. What are covenanted blessings but blessings which revelation has expressly taught men to expect, and which the Almighty hath graciously engaged to bestow? And what are uncovenanted blessings, but blessings which appertain to those who are personally strangers to the covenant of promise? It cannot justly be said of any, except those to whom the "means of grace and the hopes of glory" are expressly revealed, that they are personally and individually parties to that glorious engagement. Even if the heathen world be substantially partakers in the blessings of that covenant, they are yet without the privilege of pleading the promises of God, and of claiming the fulfilment of them in the name of their Redeemer. When summoned to their account at the second Advent of Christ, they will be wholly without the knowledge that he is both their Advocate and their Judge. With regard to them, therefore, it may reasonably and truly be said, that whatever mercy they may find on that day will be uncovenanted mercy; since they ended their lives in ignorance of the stipulations by which that mercy was secured to them.

We are aware, indeed, that to Mr. Grinfield this explanation will probably be anything but satisfactory. He contends, that the whole human race, were, from the beginning, parties to the covenant of redemption. The original promise, he argues, was to the woman's seed; an expression large enough to comprise the whole posterity of Eve without exception. The promise to Abraham was, that in his seed should all the nations of the earth

* In page 415, the author himself has quoted from Limborch a very satisfactory description of uncovenanted mercy. "Nihil repugnat ut imputetur (redemptio), *non vi promissi alicujus divini*, sed per immensam gratiam divinam—illis, qui, postquam mundo prædicatus est (Christus), cum absque culpâ suâ ignorant." Theol. Christ. Lib. IV. sect. xiii. p. 238. Ed. 1686.

be blessed; words sufficiently capacious to embrace all human-kind; and which the subsequent covenant, entered into with the tribes of Israel, after an interval of more than four hundred years, and for a totally distinct purpose, could have no power to narrow or disannul. He infers, accordingly, that, by virtue of these promises, all the families of the earth were formally included in the design of redemption; that the most ignorant tribe of idolaters has, at this day, as clear and express an interest in it, as the most enlightened community of Christians; and that to confine its blessings to Christ's visible Church, would be a mistake precisely similar to that, which led the Jews to believe, that the gracious purposes of Jehovah were framed exclusively with reference to themselves.

Now with this conclusion itself, if legitimately attained, we should have no quarrel. It is a conclusion towards which the hopes and the views of some of the wisest and best men have always been anxiously directed, and upon which every humane mind would very gladly rest. But we must, nevertheless, contend that it is beyond the power of argument to convey us to this conclusion directly from the above premises. We maintain that the language of the original promise, as well as that of the promise to Abraham, are perfectly compatible with a scheme of partial redemption, that is, with a scheme which should exclude from its benefits all, except those to whom it might be revealed. The former promise was, that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head; a promise which was abundantly fulfilled in the Saviour's victory over sin and death. By that victory a mortal wound was inflicted on the power of the devil; and yet it may be true, that ages shall elapse before his dominion shall finally expire, and all mankind be brought within the kingdom of grace. Again, the promise that the seed of Abraham should be a blessing to the world, does not require more for its fulfilment than a dispensation, which excludes and disqualifies no tribe, nor family, nor people, from admission to its benefits; and which, in the fulness of time, shall extend itself over the whole earth. Let us imagine that some ancient oracle had pronounced that England should be the queen and benefactress of all the nations of the earth. It cannot be denied that such a prophecy would be truly accomplished by the *ultimate* extension of her beneficent power and influence to every quarter of the globe. And so would the promise to Abraham be faithfully redeemed, by the gradual enlargement of the Redeemer's kingdom, till it embraced the whole of mankind; and this, even though a long period, might first elapse, during which a vast portion of the world should be shut out from

all knowledge and participation of its privileges and blessings. In neither case could it be reasonably alleged that the oracle had—

“ ——— paltered with us in a double sense,
Or kept the word of promise to our ear,
But broke it to our hopes.”

It is, indeed, said by a much higher authority than Mr. Grinfield,* that the Gospel is *Catholic and diffused*. But this is no more than might, in common parlance, be fairly said of any economy, the publication of which was accompanied by a command, that it should be preached to every creature under heaven; for which, none are disqualified by their birth or country; and which is destined ultimately to become universal. And if so, no *certain* inference can be drawn, in favour of general redemption, merely from the language of these two famous promises.

We have seen, indeed, above, that Mr. Grinfield is resolved, at all events, to understand these promises in their most literal, and most comprehensive sense; and, thus understood, they would, it must be allowed, be almost sufficient to bear the whole weight of the argument, and to render all further inquiry superfluous. If, for instance, all nations, in the largest possible signification of the phrase, are to be blessed in the seed of Abraham, there is an end of all further discussion. The blessing must, in that case, infallibly be enjoyed “by saint, by savage, and by sage,” in every clime, and in every period of the world. Mr. Grinfield should, however, be reminded, that it is very frequently most unsafe to lay upon words the whole burden of their most literal, or comprehensive meaning, and thus to make them labour in the cause of any given theory. By the same mode of proceeding, if carried on throughout the Scriptures, the strangest and most pernicious absurdities might be established; and by the rash application of it, suspicion may often be thrown upon the best and most reasonable views. Before it is adopted, it is always expedient to inquire, whether, in popular usage, the words may not have been capable of a modified signification; and, if it should prove to be so, to pause before the most rigorously literal acceptation be relied on.

We cannot forbear this opportunity of expressing how devoutly it is to be wished, that not only Mr. Grinfield, but many other divines, would carefully keep in mind, when they sit down to their theological speculations, that the language of Scripture is throughout popular; that it has little, or no technical regularity, or scientific precision; that its import is not to be collected *solely* from an attentive observation of the exact and rigorous signification of par-

* Bishop J. Taylor.

ticular words or phrases ; but rather from a constant familiarity with the manner, and style, and idiom, and if we may so speak, the physiognomy of the Sacred Writings. The waters of life do not resemble a stream conveyed along an aqueduct or canal, confined by straight banks, and square masonry, and channels hewn out of the solid rock. They may, rather, be likened to a majestic river, which winds, easily and naturally, sometimes through verdure and fertility, sometimes in the midst of wood, and wilderness, and mountain. When, therefore, we see divines, of all persuasions, deforming, as they are too apt to do, with their unbending lines, and their heavy geometrical stone-work, the graceful sweep of the river of God, who is not impelled to exclaim—

“ ——— quanto præstantius esset
Numen aquæ, viridi si margine clauderet undas
Ripa, nec ingenuum violarent marmora tophum ! ”

A little more attention to the character and genius which distinguish the works of God from the works of man, would have preserved all the grandeur, variety, and richness of the prospects, which revelation holds out to us, and would save them from being broken and interrupted by the unsightly symmetry of mere human theories and inventions.

The above remarks are applicable, not only to the instance we have been more immediately considering, but, more or less, to the whole conduct of this disquisition. The author has got it into his head, that revelation must be altogether abandoned, if the doctrine of Universal Redemption be not written there in the plainest and most legible terms ; and, accordingly, the whole materials which revelation supplies are to be moulded to the form and pressure of this theory. But, although the speculations of the author are thus open to objection, it must be allowed that the form into which he has thrown his treatise is unexceptionable, and convenient enough. He divides his work into five parts ; each part being further divided into sections, and each section devoted to the consideration of some fact, or text, which the author conceives to bear upon the subject. At the end of each part, is a summary of the argument carried on through the preceding sections. A view of the table of contents, therefore, enables the reader, almost at a single glance, to form some notion of the resources on which the writer relies, and to survey the extent of the foundations on which he rests the fabric of his system. His method, in short, is that of induction ; and at the end of his treatise he claims credit for having endeavoured to exemplify the Baconian method of investigation.

It would, of course, be utterly impossible for us to follow the author through all the details of his inquiry and argument, without inflicting on our readers a tractate of almost equal bulk. We must, therefore, confine ourselves to the selection of such specimens of his judgment and his execution, as may enable our readers to form some estimate of his fitness for the task he has undertaken.

In the second part, we find a whole section relative to the confusion of tongues. Now it might puzzle any mortal man to divine, how the confusion of tongues could be connected with the doctrine of universal redemption! The matter, however, is thus achieved by Mr. Grinfield. The confusion of language produced the dispersion of mankind. The dispersion of mankind was attended with the loss of revealed truth to the greater portion of them. The loss of revealed truth, upon the scheme of partial redemption, would expose the persons deprived of it to punishment hereafter. The punishment of men for involuntary ignorance is contrary to the attributes of God. A system which involves consequences inconsistent with His attributes cannot be true: therefore the doctrine of partial redemption must be false; and the Father of Mercies must have ordained the dispersion, for the purpose of varying the trials of men, and of proving them, as moral agents, under every variety of religious advantage and disadvantage.

It is quite needless to enter into an examination of this strange notion, that the Deity scattered the human race, for the express purpose of driving the greater portion of them away from the light of revelation! It is sufficient to remark, that the whole of the above argument depends on an assumption which we have before exposed, and which perpetually haunts the reader in his progress through the work,—the assumption that, on the partial scheme, men will be punished for their ignorance of revealed truth. It is true that “the savage, whose ancestors had found their way to Nova Zembla, might just as reasonably be punished for not knowing the use of his letters, as for not believing in a Saviour of whom he had never heard,” (p. 53.) But he will be punished neither for the one nor the other. For neither will the atoning blood of the Redeemer be needed; and for neither, will the unconscious barbarian be condemned. Whether the covenant of salvation embraces him or not, he assuredly will not be called to account for failing, where performance was absolutely impossible. The worst that will befall him, even if unredeemed, will be, to be dealt with after his actual sins, and rewarded according to his positive iniquities.

A remarkable instance of inconclusive reasoning occurs in

sect. xxi. p. 89, in which the salvability of the heathen is inferred from the regulation of the Jewish law, which allowed the stranger to be naturalized by circumcision. We are unable to discern the slightest connection between the premises and the conclusion. The enactment in question can, at the utmost, establish nothing more than this; that, by an express provision in the Mosaic Law, the privileges, which the letter of the original covenant confined to the natural descendants of Abraham, were liberally extended to his posterity by adoption. "They prove," says Mr. Grinfield, "the natural capacity of all mankind for partaking in those privileges" (p. 90), and no one can question, that the whole spirit and letter of the Christian Dispensation proves, in a certain sense, "the natural capacity of mankind" for admission to its blessings. But this analogy is, if anything, decidedly unfavourable to the author's argument; for if the stranger could not enjoy the privileges of a Jew, without the assumption of Judaism, how are we to conclude that a heathen can be invested with the hopes and blessings of the Christian covenant, without becoming a member of the Christian Church?

Sect. xxix.—It is observed by Dr. Gray, in adverting to the history of Ruth, that "the Holy Spirit, by recording the adoption of a Gentile woman into the family from which Christ was to derive his origin, might intend to intimate the comprehensive design of the Christian Dispensation," (Gray's Key, &c. p. 166.) This remark the author allows to be judicious, as far as it goes. But it is not large enough to satisfy the cravings of his liberality. He sees in this interesting narrative no less than a clear intimation, that though the Edomites and Moabites were among the examples of divine judgments on *sinful nations*, in their temporal concerns, yet that, as *individuals*, they are treated, in their eternal destinies, like the rest of mankind.—p. 113.

We must here observe, once for all, that nothing can be more unsatisfactory and more uncertain than conclusions respecting the eternal conditions of men, drawn from the merely temporal arrangements and dealings of Providence. We are not sufficiently in possession of the secret counsels of God to be confident that His ways and proceedings as to the interests of this life are framed after the likeness of His dispensations relative to the life to come. We can derive nothing more than consolatory presumptions from the benevolent and Catholic aspect of the divine purposes, which relate to transient and perishable things. To consider the admission of Ruth into the genealogy of the Saviour, as an emblem of the admission of the heathen to the blessings of his dispensation, is to carry this sort of spiritualizing interpretation to

the utmost legitimate extent that it will bear; but to infer from it that the heathen shall inherit eternal life, whether admitted into the Church of Christ or not, is to convert Scripture into allegory and mysticism.

In the fortieth section, p. 135, the author produces a variety of prophetic passages, which speak in very unlimited terms of the blessings of the Christian Dispensation; and, after admitting that these expressions have a more immediate reference to the Christian Church, he asks, "whether they may not also admit of a more wide and comprehensive interpretation; whether they may not relate to the *dispensation* as well as to the *revelation* of the Gospel?" (p. 136.) This, undoubtedly, is a question which men may very properly ask of each other; and charity will prompt them to wish that the answer may be in the affirmative. But there is nothing in the expressions themselves which can *extort* such an answer from the adversary of universal redemption. We have already adverted to the danger of filling the words of Scripture with all the meaning which they can possibly be made to contain. But of this danger the writer seems to be, throughout, totally insensible. Perhaps he may be awakened to it by an examination of the following passage of the prophet Joel:—*And it shall come to pass afterward that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh.** Now we would gladly know when this prophecy received its fulfilment? Has the spirit of the Lord yet been poured out upon *all flesh* in the most comprehensive sense of the expression? Can it be said that the operations of the Holy Ghost (be those operations what they may) have yet been extended to Esquimaux, and Greenlanders, and savages of Nova Zembla, or to the inhabitants of China and Hindostan, in any sense, which can be considered as an accomplishment of this prediction? And if not, what right has Mr. Grinfield to conclude that the scheme of redemption is, in his sense, universal, because the prophet Isaiah has foretold that *all flesh shall see the salvation of our God?* (p. 137)?

It is, indeed, alleged by him that, "as *no Scripture is of private interpretation*, it is, for the most part, safer to extend than to contract its meaning; and that if there be, as Lord Bacon expresses it, a germinant quality in every part of God's revelations, such expressions seem to have a latitude and longitude about them which can hardly be compressed within the bounds of the Christian Church," (pp. 137, 138.) We have thought it right to give the author the full benefit of these arguments, by stating them in his own words. The value of them we must leave our readers to

* Joel, ii. 28.

estimate. For our own part, we have found them "transparent as barricadoes, and lustrous as ebony!"

Sect. xliii.—From the efficacy of their repentance in preserving the Ninevites from destruction, it is concluded that, though aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, they were nevertheless, in all respects, as much the objects of God's providence and grace, as his own chosen people. The author is, indeed, aware of the distinction, usually contended for, between those dealings of the Almighty which relate to temporal and national affairs collectively, and those which spiritually relate to individuals. But this distinction he disposes of, in the present case, by reference to the words of our Saviour, who asserts, that *the men of Nineveh shall rise with this generation and condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonas.** And yet, after all, what is this, but a forcible and popular way of intimating to that generation, that their guilt was deeper than that of Nineveh; and, therefore, that their condemnation should be heavier? We often hear it said of a worthless and unprincipled person, that, compared with him, a robber or a swindler is a respectable character; but this is never thought to imply any positive commendation of either. The mode of speaking is, essentially, similar to the declaration of our Lord, that "*it shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment,*" than for those who heard and rejected the tidings of the Gospel. From neither form of expression can anything be confidently inferred respecting the interest of heathens in the covenant of salvation. The same way of speaking might have been used, even if it were certain that the heathen are not salvable. Nineveh and Sodom may be punished, and yet not so severely as those whose advantages were greater.

Sect. lii. p. 174. From the narrative in John, iv. it appears that the first positive declaration of his Messiahship was made by Christ to a poor woman of Samaria; and that certain Samaritans of the city of Sychar believed on him, and said, "*We know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world.*"

From the former of these incidents, the author collects that the Samaritans, though not regular members of the Jewish Church, were yet interested in the advent of the Messiah; and if so, that the heathens, who were scarcely more alienated than the Samaritans from the commonwealth of the faithful, were interested in it likewise. This may, perhaps, be granted; but yet, it will remain to be shown how this instance is applicable, in one way or the other, to the case of Samaritan or heathen, to whom the Messiah has never been declared. It is contended

* Matth. xii. 41.

indeed, by Mr. Grinfield, that the above confession of faith, pronounced by the Samaritans, is so vague and imperfect as to leave them almost upon a level with those who had never known the Saviour, or heard of him; and that if the very imperfect knowledge of the former were graciously accepted, the same indulgence will, of course, be conceded to the latter.

Now, on this argument, it is to be observed, that we are wholly without the means of ascertaining whether the faith of these Samaritans was such, as could have qualified them for admission into the visible Church of Christ. Let us, then, put it in the alternative,—either their faith was sufficient for that purpose, or it was not. If it was not, they must, for the purposes of this argument, be identified with all other persons remaining without the pale of that Church; and, consequently, their case can afford no illustration as to the spiritual hopes and prospects of the Gentiles. If their faith was sufficient, they may, perhaps, be considered as standing within the pale; and their case will, then, prove nothing more than that, which no mortal disputes, namely, that pagan or Samaritan, on believing in Christ, may partake of the benefits of the Christian Dispensation!

Sect. liii. p. 176, relates to the miraculous cure of the nobleman's son. Of this, and of all other miracles performed for the relief of Gentiles, it may be remarked, that no safe conclusion can be drawn from them respecting their spiritual condition. The ordinary Providence of God, apparently, makes no distinction between Christian and heathen; and there is no reason for supposing that his extraordinary, or miraculous, Providence should observe a different rule. That such incidents furnish "an evidence of the mind and character of the Redeemer," may be admitted; but not such an evidence as Mr. Grinfield contends for. He affirms that "it would be altogether *incredible* to impute harshness, or indifference about millions, to One who could thus compassionate individuals."—(p. 177.) And hence it must obviously be inferred, that such harshness and such indifference *must* be imputed to that Beneficent Being by all who question the universality of His redemption! Now this is a mode of argument which deserves the severest reprehension;—it is in the highest degree uncandid, unphilosophical, and presumptuous. How can we dare to pronounce that a limited scheme of redemption is *necessarily* incompatible with the Divine benevolence? The earth is frequently swept by plague and pestilence,—millions have been known to perish in the lingering agonies of famine:—throughout the world, by far the larger portion of mankind are doomed to eat the bread of misery and of toil, and to extort from every day that passes over their heads, a

scanty and precarious supply for the cravings of nature; and yet, mysterious and overpowering as these dispensations appear, few are insane enough to make them the ground for imputing to the Deity "harshness and indifference towards millions." Why, then, is it to be insinuated that they, who cannot find universal redemption in Scripture, must be content to worship a God who looks with unconcern upon the sufferings of His creatures? It is a very unworthy artifice, in controversy of any sort, to make the cause of an adversary odious, by imputing to his argument consequences which he disclaims; and in theological controversy the practice is peculiarly blamable. Theology, from its very nature, often involves paradoxes, which the limited capacity of man is unable to reconcile; it is, therefore, a region of debate which, more than any other, demands a constant recollection of human infirmity, and a constant watchfulness against uncandid and uncharitable insinuations.

Sect. lv. p. 180. In reference to the precept that we are to "*love our enemies*," the author remarks—

"Certain it is, that if we could believe that the great body of mankind were excluded from the capability of salvation, we should be deprived of every motive to love them, and they would then stand nearly in the same relation to us as the fallen angels.

"No man is called upon to exercise greater benevolence than the Deity whom he adores. If, then, the Deity be partial and austere, *reaping where he hath not sown, and gathering where he hath not strawed*, his worshippers will naturally indulge the same emotions."—pp. 180, 181.

Here, again, we find it plainly implied, that a partial redemption would necessarily constitute the Deity austere, malevolent and iniquitous; and we have, besides, the scarcely less reprehensible notion, that created and fallible beings would be authorized to imitate the Almighty in the manifestations of his mysterious severity. It is difficult to figure to ourselves a more pernicious or presumptuous imagination. And then, supposing the heathen, so long as they remain unconverted, to be incapable of salvation, is there no difference between them and the apostate spirits? Are they to be placed, like devils, beyond the pale of all human charities, and to be denied all kindly and benevolent offices? Is it to be forgotten that a heathen *may* be reclaimed, and thus, at least, may become an heir of salvation,—but that the fallen angels are incurably wicked and malicious? If it would be allowable to treat an insalvable heathen as an abomination, so long as he should remain a heathen, in what light are we now to regard a wicked man, so long as he continues impenitent? The same principle which proscribes the one, would inflict upon the

other a summary and merciless excommunication from all social sympathies; and thus would arm one portion of mankind against the other, in a desperate and interminable warfare!

Sect. lxii. p. 197. "The Son of Man shall come in the glory of the Father, with his angels; and then shall he reward every man according to his works."—*Matthew*, xvi. 27.

From these words the author conceives it to follow, "by plain and incontrovertible inference," that Christ now stands towards the heathen in the same relation as though they had been personally acquainted with his mediatorial character. He reasons thus:—Since Christ is to judge all men, he must bear a previous relation to all; he could bear no previous relation to men, otherwise than as their Saviour and Redeemer,—therefore Christ is the Saviour and Redeemer of all men.

We are entirely unable to perceive how the gainsayer is to be compelled to grant the first of the above propositions. By what *necessity* must the Judge of all men bear to those who are to be judged any other relation than that of their Creator, to whom all hearts are open and from whom no secrets are hid? If we were told that Christ has been appointed to judge the inhabitants of all the planets of our system, how would this lead us to the surmise that some mysterious dispensation *must* first intervene, by which he might be brought into some particular relation towards them; and that, without such previous process he could not be qualified to exercise the judicial office?

Upon the system of partial redemption the case stands thus: Christ will judge all men, because it is so ordained in the Divine Counsels. On the day of retribution it will appear that no man's life has been sufficiently meritorious to *entitle* him to reward, or even sufficiently innocent to *entitle* him to acquittal. If, therefore, any are rewarded, it must be entirely of the bountiful goodness and free mercy of God, reserved for those who have received Christ as their Saviour and their King. But whether the recompense be of good or evil, its measure shall be adjusted according to the *comparative* merits or demerits of the individual. Now, whether this scheme be true or false, it contains nothing inconsistent with the text under consideration—since men will still be recompensed according to their works. The condition of some men at the Great Day will indeed, on this system, be much more advantageous than that of others, because Christ will be their Advocate with the Father, as well as the Arbiter of their fate. But, so far as we can perceive, a very unequal distribution of good and evil appears to enter into all the dealings of Providence, without exception. To reconcile this inequality with the essential benevolence and righteousness of the Deity is not our

business, and is clearly beyond our capacity. Where the inequality of good is attended with no *positive* suffering, the difficulty almost vanishes; but where this is not the case, nothing is left for us, who see so imperfectly, but to resort at once to the sovereignty of God for a solution; and this, for the most part, must be our only resource in questions of this nature, whether they relate to matters of temporal or eternal interest.

In sect. lxiv. p. 207, it is asked, with reference to Matth. xviii. 12, &c.

“If it be the *will* of our Heavenly Father that not one of those little ones should perish, can we suppose it possible that he has created millions of adults, without any capability of working out their salvation?”

This appeal to the compassionate nature of the Deity we have before had repeated occasion to expose, as worthless in the way of argument and as a very unfair resource of controversy. We might just as reasonably ask this question,—can we suppose it possible that the Father of Mercies should continue to create millions of human beings with moral capacities so imperfect and infirm, that the eternal perdition of a very large portion of them was a certainty in the Divine Mind previous to their creation? The perfection of the Supreme Nature we know to be not incompatible with the permission of a frightful extent of present and future misery. It is, therefore, always dangerous to pronounce that we must either reject certain views and opinions, or profanely abandon our belief in the Divine benevolence. We never can tell to what lengths, or into what regions, this line of argument may carry us.

With regard to the above expression, (“it is the *will* of our Heavenly Father,” &c.) we take this opportunity of suggesting that much perplexity might be avoided in theology, by recollecting that the word *will* cannot always have precisely the same signification in the various passages which relate to the views and designs of the Most High. Volition, in its strictest sense, denotes that state of mind which is immediately followed by action; and is properly used, with reference to the Supreme Intelligence, when contemplating anything which He will surely bring to pass. And accordingly it may, with rigorous propriety, be said, that it is the *will* of the Almighty that those should be saved who faithfully approach Him in the name of Christ. But when it is said that it is the *will* of God that *all* should be saved, it is obvious that *will* must here be used in the sense of *desire*, because the thing willed assuredly will not come to pass. That any desire of Omnipotence should remain unaccomplished, is a paradox which our wisdom must abstain from any attempt to solve. Some glimpses of light, however, may be thrown upon

the difficulty by this consideration, that when the Almighty is said to will, or to desire, anything which does not actually come to pass, the expression may be taken to signify, that the thing, when considered separately and by itself, is desirable in the mind and estimation of God; though it may not be so when contemplated with reference to the general course of His Providence, as not being compatible with His other purposes and designs. The matter may, further, be capable of some faint illustration from the language which is very legitimately and intelligibly used respecting an earthly sovereign, when we say that he *wills* and orders the execution of a criminal, although perhaps, at the same time, he does not *desire* his death.

In sect. lxxii. p. 227, Christ praying for his murderers, together with the cases of the Roman centurion and the repentant thief, are brought forward in support of the general argument. And yet it is by no means easy to discover what connection they have with the question of the salvability of the Gentiles. The personal benevolence of Jesus impelled him to intercede for his enemies, and to beg that what was done ignorantly might not be imputed to them, even although their ignorance itself was certainly not excusable; and all this might, no doubt, be reasonably (though very needlessly) alleged, in confirmation of the belief that the heathen will not be condemned for their involuntary ignorance of Christ; but how can it either confirm or weaken the position, that the intercession of Christ shall procure their pardon for offences committed without any such excuse? The case of the Roman centurion is without the slightest intelligible bearing on the question. The convulsions of nature which attended the crucifixion, extorted from him and his comrades the exclamation, "*Truly this was the Son of God!*" If this was a profession of faith sufficient to make him a Christian, it may be allowed that he became from that moment capable of salvation; if it was not, he must still be considered as a heathen,—and if so, what is there in his case which can enable us to determine whether he, or any other heathen, were salvable or not? With regard to the penitent thief, partial and imperfect as his belief might be, the declaration of it was addressed to Christ himself,—and we know that it was accepted. But what light can this throw upon the case of pagans who have never heard of Christ, and therefore must be wholly without faith in his mediation?

It is asked, in page 228, how any partial benefits can reasonably be imputed to him who exclaimed, "*And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me*"?—John, xii. 32. This passage, however, will be found to be but a treacherous auxiliary to the cause of universal redemption. If it proves anything respecting

the extent of redemption, it may be used to prove that none can ultimately perish.

In sect. lxxiii. p. 236, it is said,

“Admit the doctrine of irrespective election and reprobation, as it regards ages and nations, and you cannot disprove it as relating to individuals.”

A more egregious inconsequence cannot well be imagined. If either of the above doctrines be contained in Scripture, it must be purely as a matter of revelation; and the only question for us is, whether it is contained there or not. But that either of these doctrines necessarily involves the other, is more than any human being can ever be entitled to pronounce.

Sect. lxxxi. p. 272, appeals to Rom. ii. 12—15. This celebrated passage undoubtedly harmonizes well with the more liberal doctrine; but yet, on the other hand, it most certainly contains nothing conclusive against the opposite opinion. After all, it informs us only that a comparative estimate will be formed of the lives of heathens, according to the light which they had enjoyed. If they had no clear and systematic rule,—nothing but a conscience rudely informed, and a moral sense imperfectly developed,—their failures would be more leniently dealt with than if their knowledge of their duty were more precise, systematic, and complete. But whether they are within the promise of eternal life and its rewards, the passage leaves wholly undetermined.

Perhaps the eighty-seventh section furnishes as remarkable a specimen as any in the book, of the author's resolution to extort testimony from Scripture, as it were by the rack. By some commentators the very difficult passage of St. Paul, Rom. viii. 18—22, is supposed to contain a figurative and most impressive description of the impatience of the whole world for its deliverance from the miserable consequences of the fall of man. The creation is represented as groaning under its present burdens; as looking forth, with earnest expectation, for that day which shall invest it with a glorious liberty; as anxious for the universal diffusion of pure Christianity, or for whatever glorious change may be implied in the expression—*the manifestation of the sons of God*. Now the argument built by Mr. Grinfield on these words, (if we rightly divine his meaning,) seems to be this:—the whole creation is impatient for its release from the bondage of corruption; but the heathen are a part of the creation,—*therefore* the heathen are now, and always have been, capable of salvation! This inference, however, labours under one infirmity,—that it takes for granted the whole matter in debate; namely, that all *must* be within the covenant of grace who are suffering from the evils for which that covenant provides a remedy.

The truth is, that the passage in question is one from which a sober-minded expounder would hardly look for aid in an argumentative treatise. It is an instance of sublime, and truly scriptural rhetoric. The creation is said to travail in pain, just as the land is said to mourn, or the earth to call for rain, or the nation to cry out for deliverance from oppression; phrases which introduce the impatience for relief, purely to intimate the extent and violence of the evil. But who would ever think of confidently deriving, merely from the confusion and wretchedness which are prevalent throughout the world, any inference whatever, as to the nature and extent of the operation, which a corrective or remedial economy might have upon those who never heard of it?

Sect. xciv. p. 302. "*The love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all,*" &c. 2 Cor. v. 14. The power and beauty of this reasoning, says Mr. Grinfield, would be altogether lost, if it could be shown that the great majority of mankind were not included in its meaning. This, however, is by no means obvious. The love of Christ would be a constraining motive with sincere Christians, even on the exclusive system; unless it can be shown that our attachment to a benefactor must be destroyed or weakened by the knowledge, or the belief, that his bounty is chiefly directed towards ourselves.

The reasoning in sect. xcix. p. 313, is wholly inconclusive. How does it follow, from the proper divinity of Christ, that the redemption which he has effected must necessarily be universal,—that, because he is the Maker of all things, he must be the Saviour of all men? Nothing can safely be concluded from the divinity of the Saviour, except that his dispensation must be framed with perfect wisdom and goodness, and must *prosper in the thing whereto he hath appointed it*. What may or may not be consistent with his perfection, or what are all the precise objects of his dispensation, it is not for man, probably not for angels, confidently to pronounce.

In sect. c. p. 315, the author affirms that the partial scheme tends to rob the Redeemer of a great part of his glory. To all such intimations as this there is one very simple reply;—what may be for the glory of the Redeemer, he himself must be the best judge. Whether his work be partial or universal, we may be quite assured that it will ultimately redound to his honour, and power, and majesty. We may, therefore, very safely dismiss all anxiety on this head, and search the Scriptures, without fear of encountering there anything which is unworthy of the character of the Saviour.

The words quoted in sect. cii. p. 319, τοὺς ἕξω ὁ θεὸς κρίνει, though employed by the Apostle for a different purpose, are

calculated to give just the proper direction to our thoughts on this mysterious question. The heathen are to be left to the judgment of God. It is not our province to pronounce upon their case, though we may indulge a strong and reasonable hope that salvation shall be extended to them.

The text 1 Tim. iv. 10, quoted in sect. civ. p. 323, is, undoubtedly, a potent authority in favour of universal redemption; and yet, powerful as it is, the author's vindication of it is almost calculated to weaken it, and render it suspected. He observes, that the word *σωτήρ* cannot here be taken to signify a Preserver, in the ordinary sense of the word, for that the preservation of men in this life would be a curse, if it were to end in destruction hereafter! a position which would be sufficient to prove that God cannot justly be entitled the Preserver of all or any portion of mankind, unless it can be shown that the impenitently wicked shall be annihilated at their death!

The passage Heb. ii. 9,—“*That he might taste death for every man,*” is likewise a strong text, which Doddridge in vain attempts to qualify, by adding, “for every man who would obediently accept of life through him.” Mr. Grinfield, however, has contrived to hang about the neck of this authority, the dead weight of an argument which is absolutely good for nothing: namely, that if Christ took upon himself the nature of the heathen, as well as of others, the heathen cannot be excluded from the benefits of his incarnation, (p. 326.) Surely, whether Christ came to redeem all men, or some men, it would be equally necessary that he should assume the nature of man; and if it were needful that the Redeemer should suffer in that nature, which had been guilty, his incarnation would have been required even for the salvation of a single transgressor.

In sect. cv. p. 327, it is asserted, that to suppose Christ's redemption to be partial is to deny the *divinity* of his atonement. Let us then for a moment imagine, that God chose to redeem only a portion of mankind; is the author prepared to assert that this could have been accomplished by a less costly ransom? The blood of the incarnate Son is precious enough to redeem innumerable millions. But who can venture to assert that less than that blood would have been sufficient to redeem one?

Sect. cx. p. 335, *Thou hast redeemed us out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.*

The author here asks, how this text could be fulfilled if, to this variety of tongues and languages, has been denied the possibility of salvation? To this question he will have a sufficient answer, if he will endeavour to imagine himself a spectator of the solemnities of retribution, beholding at the right hand of the Saviour an

innumerable company of the ransomed, collected from every corner of the globe without distinction, and consisting of persons whom the sound of the Gospel had reached, in the course of its victorious progress over the earth. His spirit would then perceive, that this text *might* be accomplished, without an extension of the benefits of redemption to those who never were brought to the knowledge of it. He would likewise see that the redeemed would not be "that little company which Calvin and his followers are supposed to assert." It would be a countless multitude—comprising, perhaps, an overpowering majority—not of those hitherto born—but of those who shall have been born, during the whole interval, between the fall of Adam and the consummation of all things.

We have produced and examined these specimens, certainly not with the view of throwing discredit or suspicion on the doctrine of Universal Redemption, but for the purpose of showing that Mr. Grinfield is by no means a safe guide through the mazes of that very delicate and difficult question. He has taken upon himself to pronounce with more adventurous confidence than any of his predecessors. He has declared that, if the doctrine of limited redemption were to be found in the Old or New Testament, it would justify any man for becoming a professed unbeliever, (p. 201.) He shrinks from all doubt on the subject, as from something perfectly *terrific*, (p. 202.) He affirms, that if such a doctrine were to be delivered to us by the hand of an angel, it ought, without hesitation, to be rejected; for that it strikes at the root of all religion generally, (by impeaching the benevolence of God,) and of Christianity in particular, by virtually impugning the divinity of the Saviour. Warburton, himself, could not have decided in a tone of more arrogant dogmatism. The above instances of false reasoning, and misapplication of Scripture, and want of insight into the spirit and genius of the Sacred Writings, show how little he is entitled to assume an air so lofty and commanding. The utmost that, after all, can be said for him is, that he has left the doctrine precisely where it was before; and we have been occasionally tempted to doubt whether even this praise be not rather beyond his deserts. He has summoned to his aid such a multitude of feeble or treacherous arguments, that his services have a tendency to weaken, for a time, our respect for the cause, which he has felt himself impelled to maintain, even "to the utterance."

It is not, however, to be concluded from this censure, that his work contains nothing which merits commendation. We had marked down for citation various passages, exhibiting juster views of the true grounds, on which we may rest our belief, or rather

our hope, that the design of redemption embraces the whole family of mankind; although, as a revelation, it may be withheld, for ages to come, from a large portion of the globe. Our limits, however, disable us from giving insertion to these passages as we had intended. We trust, that no injustice will be inflicted on the author, by this our reluctant suppression of his happier efforts. And in order to prevent any such effect, we think it right to express our decided opinion, that his book may be useful, though his own views be often exceptionable and incorrect. It may be useful, among other reasons, for that which we have intimated above, namely, that it affords, by its arrangement, an easy access to the Scriptural authorities that bear upon the question; and that, from its inductive method, it enables a judicious reader to separate and throw aside those attestations, and those arguments, on which he thinks no safe reliance can be placed.

The work is further rendered valuable by an "Appendix containing the sentiments of English and foreign divines respecting the salvability of the heathen," exhibited in pertinent quotations from their writings. It must be signally gratifying and consolatory to find, among the supporters of the more mild and catholic system, so many great and venerable names. Among these, the greatest, perhaps, is that of Barrow; and to his "powerful and elaborate defence of this doctrine," the author refers, as to an authority almost conclusive. We have been tempted, by this reference, to refresh our recollection of these celebrated discourses; and we have been very forcibly struck, on the review, by the caution and diffidence with which this great divine approaches the examination of the question, as it relates to the heathen, when compared with the sweeping turbulence with which the present author sometimes dashes through the difficulties of the subject. It is true that Barrow lavishes all the vast stores of his Scriptural and ecclesiastical learning in establishing and illustrating the position, that Christ is the Saviour of all men; and that the design of the Christian Dispensation was, to render all men *salvabiles* and *salvandos*. But when he comes to apply this principle to persons who, in any age of the world have been without the knowledge of this gracious economy, it is obvious that he lowers the tone of confidence and certainty to that of strong presumption and earnest hope. He speaks of "divers good inducements" for believing in other communications of grace, besides those vouchsafed to the Christian Church, though "not so plainly signified, or expressly promised," (p. 73.)* And in reply to the objection, "That having such grace is inconsistent with the want of an explicit

* These references are to the volume of Select Sermons from Barrow, Oxon. 1812.

knowledge of Christ, and of faith in him ;” he asks, “ why may we not say, that as, *probably*, most good people, before our Lord’s coming, received grace without any such knowledge or faith ; that, as to idiots and infants, our Saviour’s meritorious performances are applied (in a manner unknowable by us) without so much as a capacity to know or believe anything ; so we (to whom God’s judgments are inscrutable, and his ways uninvestigable) know not how grace may be communicated, and Christ’s merits may avail for other ignorant persons ?”—p. 79.

Again, in his third sermon on this subject, he supposes it to be asked “ Why then is not the Gospel revealed unto men ? How comes it to pass that no sound of this saving word—no glimpse of this heavenly light, doth arrive to many nations ? How can so general and large intention consist with *so particular and sparing execution* ? What benefits can we imagine them capable to receive from this performance of our Saviour, who still do sit in total ignorance of the Gospel in darkness and the shadow of death ? How can they call on him on whom they believe not ; and how can they believe in him of whom they have not heard ?”

And what is his answer to this objection ? (p. 84.) Does he indignantly maintain that the execution is not sparing or particular ? Does he broadly assert that they who sit in ignorance of the dispensation, do, without knowing it, receive its benefits ? Does he rashly affirm, that the heathen are in as full possession of God’s covenanted mercies, as the most enlightened company of faithful men ? Take the substance of his own reply, (p. 85.)

“ God’s intentions (he observes) are not to be interpreted, nor his performances estimated by events, depending on the contingency of human actions ; but by his own declarations and precepts, together with the ordinary provision of competent means, in their own nature sufficient to produce the effect contemplated. God would have all men live in peace, and order, and health ; and yet this object is defeated, (if we may so speak,) by human passion and perverseness. God desires that his Church should flourish in knowledge and piety, in peace and charity ; and yet, in spite of the appointment of ample means for the accomplishment of that purpose, the Church is overrun with ignorance and error, with impiety and discord. So God, having declared that he would have all men to know and embrace the Gospel, and having made ample provision for its promulgation ; yet, if by human obstinacy and neglect, God’s heavenly truth become not universally known, it is unreasonable to conceive Him not universally to desire and design men’s instruction and salvation consequent thereupon.” He then, for the illustration of the case, “ propounds a similitude.” “ He supposes a sovereign, at the mediation of his own son, to grant to his revolted subjects a universal pardon and amnesty, (universal as to its design and tenor,) but that the clemency of the prince is by some rejected ; to others unknown in consequence of the neglect or misconduct of the messengers instructed to proclaim it ; and that, from other accidental causes, the knowledge of it never reaches the remoter provinces. He then observes, that, although the effect of

that pardon would thus be obstructed, the failure of execution could not detract from the real amplitude of the prince's intent. He meant favourably toward all, and provided carefully for all; although, by accident, (not imputable to him,) *the designed favours and benefits do not reach all.*"—p. 85—87.

Such is the language of one of the greatest champions of the doctrine of Universal Redemption; and, most assuredly, it is not the language of one, who imagined that we could be in a condition fearlessly to dogmatize respecting that point, as if it were a matter plainly and distinctly written in the revelation of God. He speaks of it as something which the attributes of the Deity and the language of Scripture render clear, as it relates to those within the pale of the Church; and highly probable, as it relates to those who still remain without. Mr. Grinfield, however, we have seen, has not been restrained, by modesty or fear, from occupying higher ground; from throwing himself into a position which Barrow seems to have thought too arduous and too difficult for him to maintain!

Bishop Jer. Taylor was another of our divines whose spirit was abhorrent from all systems which bear an austere and unrelenting aspect. And yet, he did not dare to speak of heathens as if they had a clear and *covenanted* interest in the mercies of God. We would recommend to Mr. Grinfield's consideration the following passage from the second sermon on the miracles of the Divine Mercy.

"There are many *secret and undiscerned mercies* by which men live, and of which men can give no account, till they come to give God thanks at their publication. And of this sort is the mercy which God reserves for the souls of many millions of men and women, concerning whom we have no hopes, if we account concerning them by the usual proportions of revelation and the Christian commandments. Yet we are taught to *hope* some strange good things concerning them, *by the analogy and general rules of the Divine Mercy*. For what shall become of ignorant Christians?—of people that live in the wildernesses?—of people that are baptized, and taught to go to church, it may be, once a-year; people that can get no more knowledge? they know not where to have it, nor how to desire it! And yet that an eternity of pains shall be consequent to such ignorance, is unlike the mercy of God. And yet, that they should be in any disposition towards an eternity of intellectual joys, is *no where set down in the leaves of Revelation*.

"The effect of this consideration I would have to be this, that we may publicly worship this mercy of God, which is kept secret; and that we be not too forward to sentence all heathens and prevaricating Jews to the eternal pains of Hell, but to *hope* that they have a portion in the secrets of the Divine Mercy; where, also, unless many of us have some little portions deposited, our condition will be very uncertain, and some-

times most miserable. But, as in these things, we must not pry into the *secrets of the Divine Economy, being sure, that whether it be so or not, it is most just, even as it is*; so we may expect to see the glories of the Divine Mercy made public, in unexpected instances, in the great day of manifestation."

We presume that every cautious and sober-minded inquirer will be content to take his stand upon the ground occupied by these venerable and illustrious men. It is obvious, that, to their eyes, the doctrine in question appears, as it were, to shine through the substance and texture of the Scriptures, but not to be exhibited to mortal sight in all the plenitude of its splendour. Of that *excellent glory*, they seem to have beheld enough to brighten their hope, and to animate their charity; but not enough for the eye of faith to rest upon, with that fulness and distinctness of mental vision, which is impressed by other scenes and objects in the compass of revelation. In their survey of this region of the divine dispensations, they never, for a moment, lost sight of the saying, that *the ways of God are not as our ways, nor His thoughts as our thoughts*. It never occurred to them that the Scriptures must be cast aside, if they should appear to contain a doctrine, which human capacities and feelings might find it hard to bear. They went forth on their inquiry, like the Patriarch, *not knowing whither they went*, and resolved, at all events, to follow the leading of the Holy Ghost. And, doubtless, "their soul did magnify the Lord, and their spirit rejoiced in God their Saviour," when they discerned, that many a gleam of mercy seemed to issue from His Throne towards the benighted regions of the earth, and to pierce the thick darkness which has so long been allowed to rest upon them.

To conclude, then, if we were required to state, what are the precise views which may be safely and scripturally entertained, respecting the extent of the Christian redemption, we should say, as we have already intimated, that our views should be those of a cheerful and steady hope—a hope that should *make us not ashamed* to regard the heathen almost, if not altogether, as if they were, already *fellow-heirs with ourselves, and of the same body, and partakers of God's promise in Christ*. And if we were asked upon what grounds we should recommend this charitable and comprehensive scheme of thought, we might safely reply by referring the inquirer to Mr. Grinfield's volume for an answer; for he will find there—together with a miscellaneous heap of hay, and stubble and other perishable matters—good store of the more precious and solid materials, out of which this comfortable presumption may be substantially built up. If pressed to enumerate the chief reasons for this persuasion, we should mention the comprehensive

language of the prophecies of the Old Testament—the general declarations of God's mercy and loving-kindness—the certainty that the spiritual knowledge of the most enlightened Jews, with all their advantages, was very indistinct, and the consequence, that perfect conceptions relative to the Messiah's office are not, in their own nature, absolutely necessary to salvation—the personal character of the Saviour himself, and the perpetual tenor of his doctrines and precepts, which breathe, throughout, the tenderest philanthropy, and seem abhorrent from all exclusive systems. All these—combined with certain passages of Scripture which speak of Christ as the Redeemer of the world, though, more especially the Saviour of them that believe—show like a cloud of witnesses in behalf of the hypothesis that redemption is universal; and that men, who have not enjoyed the revelation of Christianity, may yet be saved by virtue of it. And if it be further demanded how those texts are to be disposed of, which speak of faith as the necessary channel by which the blessings of the Gospel are to be conveyed to the soul, the answer must be, that such texts may reasonably be understood, with especial reference to those to whom the Gospel has been propounded; and that the blessings there alluded to may be considered as certain privileges peculiar to the Christian Church,* and as distinguished from the advantages conveyed by the Christian *dispensation* to the whole human race. The result of these two classes of texts, when taken together, will be, what we have described above, not a positive certainty, but a consolatory and strong presumption, that Jews, and Mahometans, and heathens shall partake of the Christian redemption, and that all are salvable not *by*, but *in* the Law, under which they have lived.

But if the tone of dogmatism be reprehensible, even on the milder side of this great question, it is absolutely intolerable when resorted to by the advocates of the more inflexible and repulsive doctrine. It will have appeared, from our previous remarks, that we are disposed to acquit Calvinism of some portion of the inhumanity and absurdity which are often laid to its charge. But yet we confess, that it enters not into our heart to conceive, how men can listen, without utter consternation of spirit, to the peremptory and imperious tone of its responses, relative to the eternal doom of those, whom circumstances, or education, have placed without the inclosure of the Christian Church. When we hear Augustine, without doubt or mercy, condemning all Jews, and heathens, and heretics, to everlasting torments, we gladly appeal to the same Augustine, in his sober moments, for safer principles of judgment

* *Grim.* p. 249, &c.

on this and every other question of grave difficulty and solemn importance. It is a relief to find the man, who could pronounce, with an unfaltering tongue, the perdition of innumerable millions, prescribing in another place, the true spirit of moderation and humility, which ought to regulate all controversial discussions and inquiries.

“ Illud, quovis iudice, impetrare me a vobis oportet, ut, in utrâque parte, omnis arrogantia deponatur. Nemo nostrûm dicat se jam invenisse veritatem. Sic eam quæramus, quasi ab utrisque nesciatur. Ita enim diligenter et concorditer quæri poterit, si nullâ temerariâ presumptione, inventa et cognita esse credatur.”*

Had the spirit which dictated this passage presided over all the disputes and investigations of theology, we surely never should have heard of the Romish doctrine, that certain damnation awaits all who die without the pale of the Catholic Church; or the still more appalling dogma, that salvation never was even *designed* for any, whether within or without the Church, except a mere remnant according to the election of grace. We might, indeed, have heard of divines upon whom the sacred text appeared to force such doctrines, and who might accordingly feel compelled to surrender their own understandings upon these dark points, to the authority of the Written Word. But we never should have witnessed a successful attempt to erect such notions into a regular system, or to give them a place in any scheme of scientific and dogmatical theology. The true spirit of moderation and self-distrust would have protected the consciences, and the feelings, and the common sense of mankind, from the violence and commotion which such maxims are calculated to inflict. The tenets in question might then have been confined to the cell, or the cloister, or the study of the recluse; they might have inflamed the zeal,—perhaps they might have swelled the spiritual pride,—of a few fanatical spirits; but they never would have gone forth to embitter Christian charity, and to disturb the peace of the world.

We cannot conclude our remarks without expressing our entire agreement with Mr. Grinfield in one point, namely, that much unjust suspicion has attached to the doctrine of Universal Redemption, chiefly in consequence of its apparent hostility to the great principle of Justification by Faith; or rather, in consequence of its supposed tendency to supersede entirely the necessity of faith. If all may be saved without belief in Christ, and without any knowledge of his mission, the whole of revelation, it has been contended,

* *August.* quoted by Lardner, part ii. vol. vi. p. 425.

is altogether nugatory.* For why should that be revealed, the knowledge or acceptance of which is utterly useless, and does nothing whatever to improve the hopes or the condition of the believer? In reply to this question, it may be observed,

1. First, that the Almighty may have reasons, neither known nor fit to be known by us, for a partial revelation of the design by which he purposes to accomplish the redemption of the human race. It cannot be denied that there is a very striking analogy between the dispensations of Providence and those of Grace; and there is nothing adverse to this analogy in the supposition, that God may have chosen to invest certain portions of mankind with spiritual advantages and distinctions of such an illustrious nature, as to give them the appearance of his favourites in the estimation of those who survey the history of his dealings. There is, accordingly, nothing opposed to the general spirit and tenor of his proceedings, in the appointment of particular communities to the office of guardians and depositaries of his truth, until the season for its universal reception should arrive. And if it should still be inquired,—why should the knowledge of that truth be preserved at all, if the ignorance of it be no hindrance to man's salvation? we can only answer, that God has thought it most for his own glory, that his transcendent attributes of mercy and righteousness should never be left without a signal testimony in the world; and that they who have been entrusted with the knowledge of his gracious counsels are placed, as it were, in the most honourable rank of that warfare, by which it is his pleasure to prove the sons of men. And it must further be remembered, that as the rewards of fidelity in that post will be unutterably glorious, so will the punishment of faithlessness be proportionately severe.

2. In the second place, it should be remembered, that whatever may be the dignity and efficacy of faith, it is by no means clear that faith in a vicarious atonement, is in its own nature absolutely essential to man's acceptance with God. Faith, indeed, is a principle, without which, under any dispensation, it is impossible to please Him: and there are, probably, few states of human society so dark and so degraded as to be wholly destitute of opportunities for the exercise of it. The influence and operation of it, however, will, of course, vary according to the means and facilities

* These narrow views probably gave birth to the following note of Doddridge, to John, iii. 15. "It is here implied, that *all* in their natural state *must* perish; and that, till men enter into this important truth, the Gospel may, indeed, be their amusement; but I see not how it is like to be their joy or cure." If by *natural state* is meant the condition of the world had there been no Redeemer, or the condition of those individuals who incorrigibly neglect his salvation, the position is just. But we fear the statement is intended to embrace those who have never been brought to Christ!

for its growth and discipline; and it is reasonable to suppose that the assignment of its rewards will be regulated by a due regard to all such varieties of circumstance and situation. But under no dispensation is faith to be regarded as a substitute for other virtues. Its value depends chiefly on this consideration; that, whatever may be the religious opinions and doctrines of the individual, it is by the principle of faith that they must be made available to his spiritual welfare and advancement. Without faith all religious notions and systems will tend no more to the reformation of life, or the purification of heart, than the theorems of geometry or the discoveries of chemistry. Indeed, a religion without faith, like a faith without works, is a perfect anomaly. It is wholly destitute of the principle of life. And if this be so, it must follow that none can be saved, under any law, dispensation, or system, if they are strangers to this sentiment; though the effect of it on their conduct and their views must necessarily be different, under different religious conditions and predicaments.

A reference to the spiritual state of the Jews previous to the advent of the Messiah, will afford considerable illustration to this subject. As it has been justly observed by a great writer—

“What were the precise views entertained by the true Israel of the offices of the Messiah and of the work of redemption, is one of the most curious and intricate questions of theology. There is reason to suspect that the average degree of knowledge which divines have been accustomed to ascribe to Jewish believers, has been overrated. . . . A general expectation of the Messiah's advent, as of some glorious and divine personage, who would bestow the highest temporal and spiritual felicity, without descending to details or foreseeing the precise method by which the interposition was to be effectual, appears to have nearly bounded the views of such as waited for the consolation of Israel. . . . Thus vague and general, at least, were the expectations of the faithful at the time of his appearance. To suppose they were ever materially different is a gratuitous supposition totally devoid of proof.”*

If, then, the faith of Jewish believers were thus imperfect, and yet is to be considered as available to their salvation, it cannot be very unreasonable to surmise that the faith of virtuous heathens may, through the bounteous mercy of God in Christ Jesus, be counted to them for righteousness, although much less conversant about the truth than that of the pious Israelite.

On the other hand, it is not perhaps very difficult to assign reasons for the degree of ambiguity which is still suffered to hang about the question—as to the extent of redemption considered as

* Robert Hall, on the Difference between Christian Baptism and that of John.

a dispensation. Had the command to preach the Gospel to all nations been accompanied with a positive and distinct assurance, that they who were placed beyond the reach of the good tidings should, nevertheless, be included in the gracious design which they announced,—can any one, not wholly ignorant of human nature, doubt of the consequences of such a declaration? Would it not have breathed into unstable minds a suspicion that, after all, it could be of little moment whether men became Christians or not, if the knowledge of Christianity were not necessary to salvation? And might it not have plucked out the very heart of that zeal which is needful for the prosecution of missionary labours? Might it not have gradually introduced and established a general persuasion, that all religions are alike, and that it must be useless to disturb men in the exercise of the faith handed down to them from their forefathers? Might it not have cherished that pernicious spirit of liberalism which, like a baleful weed, is always too ready to shoot up into rankness and luxuriance, and to starve the growth of all sound religious principle? Whereas, at present, the light, which is permitted to force its way through the darkness, is sufficient to relieve our spirits from dejection and despondency, but is far from being vivid enough to encourage a careless and irreverent presumption.

Not that the doctrine of Universal Redemption, if established beyond all possible controversy, would leave enlightened and intelligent Christians without the amplest motives for endeavouring to diffuse the blessings of the Gospel throughout all the regions of the earth. In the first place they would have the command of Christ delivered to his immediate followers,—that they should go forth and proclaim the Gospel to every creature under heaven; a command which proves beyond all question that, as a revelation, Christianity is designed to become universal, and that all cordial and judicious efforts for its diffusion must be conformable to the will of the Most High. In addition to this great and overruling motive, may be mentioned two potent auxiliary considerations; namely, that to establish pure Christianity is to destroy idolatry, and every form and variety of false religion, together with their brood of impurities and abominations, which must, at least, be dangerous to salvation under any religious economy whatever; and, further, that the genuine faith of Jesus Christ can never be planted, without improving the temporal happiness of mankind, and spreading the blessings of peace, and order, and civilization. With these momentous reasons for the conversion of the world constantly before our eyes, we can hardly need the excitement which is incessantly and prodigally applied by a certain class of persons to the religious sensibilities of the public; namely, the

outcry, that while the chariot wheels of the Gospel are tarrying, millions of idolaters are sinking into *certain* perdition.

We gladly finish our remarks on this part of the subject with the concluding paragraphs of Mr. Grinfield's book.

"It was my intention to have formed a third Appendix, from a collection of the *hard sayings* of some ancient and modern writers respecting the heathen; a host of which might have been easily summoned from missionary sermons, registers, and magazines,—'thick as autumnal leaves in Vallombrosa.' But, as I have no wish to provoke needless controversy, nor to expose the injudicious zeal of some excellent men, I shall omit this part of the work. It is impossible for any Christian not to admire the piety and devotion of those who hazard their lives, and all their temporal comforts, for the sake of spreading the knowledge of the Gospel; and I feel myself utterly unworthy of eulogizing those, "whose praise is not of men, but of God." Still, it is deeply to be lamented, that the harsh assertions of Calvinism should have been urged as a motive to excite Christian zeal in the cause of missions; and that, what is an unquestionable obligation, so far as it is practicable, should have been mingled with exaggerations which are altogether incredible. The interests of truth cannot require these monstrous misrepresentations; and while endeavouring to diffuse the knowledge of Christianity abroad, we should be cautious of placing stumbling-blocks in the way of unbelievers at home. If it were true, as has been frequently asserted, that there are now more than *six hundred millions* of heathen who are *perishing* from their ignorance of the Gospel, then it would be the instant duty of every Christian to become a missionary; and the whole of Europe should commence a crusade against Asia, Africa, and America."—pp. 458, 459.

"I cannot conclude this work without an earnest appeal to my reader for his support and encouragement of that venerable Society, to which I have ventured to inscribe this volume. When Bishop Butler was advocating the cause of this institution, he urged, as a motive for its support, 'that Christianity is to be considered as a *trust*, deposited with us on behalf of others; on behalf of mankind, as well as for our own instruction.' This particular view of Christianity, it has been one of the leading objects of this work to illustrate. How faithfully this *trust* has been discharged by this excellent Society, its missionary labours for more than a century can attest. We may well survey with pleasure and delight, an institution which, in its earlier stages, could boast of a Ziegenbalgh and a Swartz, and which has more recently embalmed with her tears a Middleton and a Heber. But, whilst I pay this homage of unfeigned respect and preference, let me not be thought unfriendly towards other missionary societies, whether amongst churchmen or dissenters. I admire their zeal, whilst I deplore its extravagance; and can rejoice in their success, even though it be tarnished with sectarianism. Such is the sanctity of the cause, that it can redeem a thousand errors; even Calvinism looks lovely, when conjoined with the spread of Christianity;—for who would criticise the missionary, going forth, as Bishop Hurd depicts him, 'with the Bible in his hand, and his Saviour in his heart,' to preach the glad tidings of redemption to the heathen world?

“But having paid this tribute of Christian charity to other missionary associations, let me again recommend that pure and peaceful Society, whose zeal is untainted with bigotry, and whose piety is unalloyed with fanaticism; a society which wants only the fostering aid of British liberality, to enable it to diffuse the blessings of the English Church through all the colonies and dependencies of the British empire.”—p. 459—461.

We ardently hope that the British public, and more especially the members of the Church of England, will not be deaf to this appeal. We trust they will show that limited and austere views of the mystery of redemption, are not *necessary* to an energetic and fervid spirit of missionary enterprise.

ART. IV.—1. *Historical Inquiries respecting the Character of Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, Lord Chancellor of England.* By the Hon. George Agar Ellis. London. Murray. 1825. pp. 182. 6s. 6d.

2. *The Correspondence and Diaries of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, and Lawrence Hyde, Earl of Rochester; published from the Original Manuscripts, with Notes.* By S. W. Singer, F.S.A. London. Colburn. 1828. 2 vols. 4to. Portraits. 5l. 5s.

LORD Orford's *Historic Doubts* can scarcely be considered in any other light than as the wantoning of a very idle ingenuity, which, unable to attain real eminence by the accurate investigation of Truth, sought to elevate itself into artificial importance by lending sportive aid to Paradox. No one ever supposed that this noble author was himself a convert to the wild opinions which he asserted and inculcated; or that he believed in his heart that less obliquity of mind or body attached to the many-murdering Richard, than that with which he has been clothed by the common suffrages of Poets and Historians. As an exercise of the Schools, or as one of those innocent questions which the Sophists were wont to moot in the playful simplicity of their Declamations, this production might, perhaps, claim a distinguished rank among its brethren; and the Essay which clears the fair fame of the crooked-back Tyrant may readily be placed on the same level with those inquiries which searched for the names of the wet-nurse of Anchises, or of the stepmother of Archemorus; or which established

the precise age of the King of the *one* Sicily, and the number of pipes of his own particular *Brontè*, with which he presented his Trojan guests on their departure.

There is this marked difference, however, between Lord Orford's *Doubts* and the other recondite trifles, for the memory of which we are indebted to the Roman Satirist. The latter, at the worst, were but mere harmless conjectures; not laying a foundation for any superincumbent theory, nor tending to establish any positive result—without object, end, or consequence. By the former, unhappily, the grave authority of History has been impugned and shaken; a fashion of misgiving has been set, even where the premisses are sufficiently sound; and a spirit of scepticism has been called up, which has never since been laid or exorcised. The reason is obvious, and it is well worth noting. Even in sport, there is no small hazard in deviating from the plain straight line of Truth. Its boundaries and landmarks are sacred, and no man has a right to remove them one hair's breadth, from their natural and legitimate position, because he fancies that, by so doing, he may make his prospect more picturesque than it was before.

Infinite and very serious mischief, we are convinced, has been produced by Lord Orford's thoughtless indulgence of a whimsical mood, in some evil hour of aristocratical leisure; yet it is but just that we should acquit him of perverse intentions. No Politics of sect or party mingled with his hypothesis; and, accordingly, in washing King Richard white, the dirt from which he endeavoured to purge his hero has not stuck to his own fingers with indelible blackness. It has been otherwise with some of those who have adopted his example with less innocent views, and who have trodden a similar path with widely different motives. The distortion of History has become a favourite weapon of controversial warfare; and we may now almost infallibly predict the costume of the *Dramatis Personæ* which are to fill the stage, by asking beforehand the name and calling of the Proprietor of the Puppet-show who exhibits them. But this violation of Honesty is not without its punishment. There are characters so blazoned to everlasting infamy, whose wickedness is so graven with an iron pen and lead upon a rock, that to become their advocates is almost to participate their guilt. Their disease is contagious, and must be shared by those who minister to them; and, if they are cleansed from leprosy, it must be at the expense of their fraudulent servant, upon whom it will be transferred, and whose knavery richly merits the infliction.

There may, indeed, be minds so strangely constituted as to

derive food for infidelity from superabundance of evidence; which may be so gorged with facts as to lose the power of digesting them; so overwhelmed with excess of light as to see only in a glass darkly. Universal consent may with such men form a source of hesitation: concurrent testimony may become a natural cause for suspicion. That which touch informs them is hard, they will dogmatically assert to be soft; and, under a full conviction that sight, smell, taste, and hearing are media, which *must* err, they will make a point of deciding on everything in direct opposition to their senses. It is enough for them that a matter has been generally accredited to establish its falsehood; sufficient that it has never yet been doubted to prove its delusion. A single instance will explain our meaning; and we will give it, without farther comment, in the words of a writer who himself, whenever it suited his purpose, well knew the full value of Historical adaptation; one who (*si quis alius*) has left behind him undeniable specimens of this plenary inspiration of the Father of Lies. They are words which we venture to recommend to Dr. Allen as a motto for his next exposure of Dr. Lingard. *Il n'est pas vrai que la Saint Barthélemy fut préméditée; car tous les Historiens, à commencer par le respectable De Thou, conviennent qu'elle le fut.**

Mr. Agar Ellis, in the little volume before us, does not belong to either of the above classes. He is not like Lord Orford; for Lord Orford has exhibited great subtilty in research after materials, and great dexterity in employing such as he found. He is not like Dr. Lingard; for Dr. Lingard has one grand leading object which he, on all occasions, endeavours to compass, and possesses, in eminence, that merit which attaches to unity of design. Such, in no wise, are the characteristics of Mr. Agar Ellis. If he reminds us of any one who has preceded him, it is of the ever-memorable Lauder.

Of great talents or, as he terms them, "vast and extraordinary powers," Mr. Agar Ellis is, very wisely, content to leave Lord Clarendon in undisputed possession. He has not the hardihood to run his head against the *κτῆμα ἐς ἀεί*, the matchless History; and he, accordingly, dismisses it with the single qualifying epithet of "party." What this epithet precisely means we are by no means sure. It were idle to expect that any narrative of events—*quorum pars magna fuit*—written by a contemporary, himself the prime-mover in many, the chief agent in most of them, should be framed according to other principles, or should advocate other doctrines than such as had been the guides of his actions. Hence, indeed, arises its greatest value. We know the precise point of

* Voltaire à M. De la Harpe.

view from which the picture has been taken, and we are therefore in possession of means by which corrections, if they be needed, may be applied to its outline. On matters of such deep and engrossing interest as those which agitated the minds of our Countrymen during the Great Rebellion, is it possible for any one, would any one wish it to be possible, to write, without becoming addicted, for the most part, to the opinions of one or other of the opponents?—and, if it were so possible, who would exchange a living and genuine History for the dry bones of nicely-balanced speculation? No sagacity of reasoning, by all its most subtle after-processes, can hope to elicit so much Truth as, of necessity, belongs to downright participation in occurrences: and as in all human matters, something of bias, of prejudice, of “party,” if you so please to call it, must inevitably be mingled, more or less; we would rather encounter this alloy (for it is less likely to exercise undue influence) when it confronts us openly and undisguisedly, advancing from the Camp of the Soldier, or the Cabinet of the Statesman, with its seal broadly stamped upon its brow; than when it steals upon us, mincingly and delicately, from the closet of the Philosopher, under the assumed garb of Impartiality.

Warburton has taken occasion freely and frequently to dissent from Lord Clarendon’s estimate of public measures: yet hear his opinion of the History, and what he thought also of *party*. “This noble Historian understood his task incomparably well. Yet has *Party* so blinded the understandings of some, who most pretend to taste, that because they dislike his political principles, they will not, or cannot see, that in the knowledge of Human Nature (the noblest qualification of the Historian) this great author excels all the Greek and Latin Historians put together.”

After his concession, such as it is, to Lord Clarendon’s talents, Mr. Agar Ellis proceeds at once to attack his integrity.

“The justness of the high reputation he has acquired on the score of virtue and probity is a very different question. I own *I am inclined to think* he was, as a minister, by no means free from the charge, or at least from a heavy suspicion, of rapacity and corruption, as well as of cruelty and tyranny.”—*Ellis’s Historical Inquiries*, pp. 18, 19.

And the first “testimony,” as he calls it, to this effect, is derived from the gossiping Pepys; who, it seems, records in his *Diary*, that Evelyn (a name never to be mentioned without respect) once told him that Lord Clarendon was a man “who never did, nor will do any thing, but for money.” “In *confirmation* of this passage” another is cited from Evelyn’s own *Diary*.

“Visited the Lord Chancellor, to whom his Majesty had sent for the Seales a few days before; I found him in his bed-chamber, very sad.

The Parliament had accused him, and he had enemies at court, especially the buffoons and ladys of pleasure, because he thwarted them, and stood in their way; I could name some of the chiefe. *The truth is, he made few friends during his grandeur among the royal sufferers, but advanced the old rebels.* He was, however, though no considerable lawyer, one who kept up the forme and substance of things in the nation with more solemnity than some would have had. He was my particular kind friend on all occasions."

To which is appended the following pithy and neatly-written note.

"Had Clarendon been the pure and virtuous minister, which some think him, would the Country have followed the example of the Court, in deserting him; and would the former have allowed the latter to persecute him so relentlessly as they did, and even encouraged them in it? I own I think not."—*Ellis's Historical Inquiries*, p. 25.

Here, then, in support of the loose tattle of Pepys, (than whom, on his own showing, few weaker or more frivolous men have ever existed,) who, be it remembered, in this place, with the true spirit of a Placelhunter, was discussing the comparative merits of Lords Clarendon and Arlington as Patrons—to *confirm* this random and, perhaps, inaccurate note of an accidental expression dropped by Evelyn in conversation, and which, probably, conveyed ten thousand times more than he either really thought or intended—to *confirm* this, is produced Evelyn's own entry of a visit to this most avaricious Chancellor, whose Soul was fixed upon Money, at one of the most trying seasons of his life. And what *confirmation* does it afford? truly thus much: that in Evelyn's weighed and sober judgment, (and there are few men whose judgment deserves more attention,) called out by observation of facts, and bearing internal evidence of Truth, Lord Clarendon, whose besetting sin, as we are told, was covetousness, had sacrificed place, power, lucre, rank and favour, the highest dignity which a subject can occupy, the readiest means of accumulating his darling Gold, because he would not minister to the follies and vices of his reckless, thoughtless, heartless Master; because he was of too pure and lofty spirit to herd with the summer swarms of panders and prostitutes who buzzed about the Royal Stye. Yet, more; because, with an honest policy which disdained any popularity courted at the expense of his Sovereign's real interests, he had strengthened a throne, newly re-established, and yet tottering on an uncertain base, by winning over those who, unless bound to it by the ties of self advantage, would have again attempted, perhaps have compassed, its overthrow. This is the key to Clarendon's advancement of the old rebels. What opinions have been expressed, in our own times, and by what party amongst us most

loudly, concerning the wisdom of an opposite conduct in the Restored Court of France?

A short passage from Lord Clarendon's own *Life* of himself is so apposite, it so fully explains the difficult position in which he was placed, and the motives which governed him, that we do not think it possible to defend his conduct towards the disappointed Cavaliers, in better words than himself has furnished.

"All mens' impatience to get, and immodesty in asking, when the King had nothing to give; with his Majesty's easiness of access, and that *imbecillitas frontis* which kept him from denying; together with rescuing himself from the most troublesome importunities by sending men to the Chancellor, could not but in a short time make him be looked upon as the man that obstructed all their pretences; in which they were confirmed by his own carriage towards them; which, though they could not deny to be full of civility, yet he always dissuaded them from pursuing the Suits they had made to the King, as unfit or unjust for his Majesty to grant, how inclinable soever he had seemed to them." —*Continuation of the Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon*, vol. iii. p. 50.

As for his dismissal, if any doubts could remain upon an unprejudiced mind, that it was effected by the artifices of the Royal Mistress, whose blighting influence he invariably opposed, these we think must be wholly removed by a perusal of Charles's own Letter to the Duke of Ormond, which Mr. Henry Ellis has just published for the first time. We must give it place below, for it shows plainly the shifts to which his ungrateful master was reduced, when he endeavours to excuse himself upon his Minister's *want of temper*.

"Whitehall, 15th Sept. (1667.)

"I should have thanked you sooner for your melancholy Letter of 26th Aug. and the good counsel you gave me in it, as my purpose was also to say something to you concerning my taking the Seals from the Chancellor; of which you must needs have heard all the passages, since he would not suffer it to be done so privately as I intended it; the truth is, *his behaviour and humour was grown so unsupportable to myself, and to all the world else, that I could not longer endure it*, and it was impossible for me to live with it and do those things with the Parliament that must be done, or the Government will be lost. When I have a better opportunity for it, you shall know many particulars that have inclined me to this resolution, which already seems to be well liked in the world, and to have given a real and visible amendment to my affairs. This is an argument too big for a Letter; so I will add but this word to it, to assure you that your former friendship to the Chancellor shall not do you any prejudice with me, and that I have not in the least degree diminished that value and kindness I ever had for you, which I thought fit to say to

you upon this occasion, because it is very possible malicious people may suggest the contrary to you.

C. *

"To my Lord Lieutenant."

But there is another *confirmation* of Lord Clarendon's rapacity in the following Note by Lord Dartmouth on a passage in Burnet.

"The Earl of Clarendon, upon the Restoration, made it his business to depress every body's merits to advance his own, and (the King having gratified his vanity with high titles) found it necessary towards making a fortune in proportion, to apply himself to other means than what the Crown could afford; (though he had as much as the King could well grant :) and the people who had suffered most in the civil war were in no condition to purchase his favour. He therefore undertook the protection of those who had plundered and sequestered the others, which he very artfully contrived, by making the King believe it was necessary for his own ease and quiet to make his enemies his friends; upon which he brought in most of those who had been the main instruments and promoters of the late troubles, who were not wanting in their acknowledgements in the manner he expected, which produced the great house in the Piccadille, furnished chiefly with Cavaliers' goods, brought thither for peace-offerings, which the right owners durst not claim when they were in his possession. In my own remembrance Earl Paulett was an humble petitioner to his sons, for leave to take a copy of his grandfather's and grandmother's pictures (whole lengths, drawn by Vandike) that had been plundered from Hinton St. George; which was obtained with great difficulty, because it was thought that copies might lessen the value of the originals. And whoever had a mind to see what great families had been plundered during the civil war, might find some remains either at Clarendon House, or at Cornbury."—*Cited by Mr. Agar Ellis, p. 28.*

Lord Clarendon died in 1673: Lord Dartmouth was born in 1672. "The great house in Piccadille," which Lord Dartmouth would have us believe, in spite of the ostentation of its founder, was furnished with the cast movables of plundered Cavaliers, had ceased to belong to the Chancellor several years before Lord Dartmouth's birth, and was levelled to the ground a very few years after it. His note, to say the least of it, is not distinguished by good nature; the statement made in it must have depended upon hearsay, and no authority is cited in its support. But, says Mr. Agar Ellis, though *the furniture* has disappeared, not so the pictures; and their existence in the present day still affords "a very important evidence of the *probability at least* of Clarendon's rapacious inclinations." The pedigree of these Pictures, traced through various hands to their present owners, Lord Clarendon

* Ellis's Original Letters, (Second Series,) iv. 39.

at the Grove in Hertfordshire, and Lord Douglas at Bothwell Castle, occupies fourteen pages; and we are assured that they consist of portraits of various persons, unconnected with the Hyde Family, but who had been the most conspicuous on the King's side during the Great Rebellion. Now, it appears to us, that if the Chancellor formed any Collection at all, this is precisely such a Collection as we should expect that he would form. He returned to England with the earliest of the Restored, to far greater wealth than most, perhaps than any, of the representatives of those Families whose Pictures were dispersed abroad amid the wrecks of their shattered fortunes; and no one was more likely to possess the inclination, as assuredly no one equally possessed the ability to concentrate them. Mr. Agar Ellis thinks otherwise; "neither is it probable that the Chancellor could have bought these Pictures, for, had they ever been on sale, there can be *no doubt* the Families to which they originally belonged would have managed to purchase them." "*No doubt*" is a very strong-looking argument, but it has something of the Bully about it, if it be at all pressed, and very rarely stands its ground in the end. We must take leave to dissent from Mr. Agar Ellis's conclusion until he shows us why the rich Chancellor *could not*, and why the poor Cavaliers *certainly could*, purchase these Pictures. But granting that they were *not* purchased—suppose that they were given—given by the rebel plunderers—accepted by him who patronized them. What, after all, is the sum of his offence? That he was well pleased to decorate his walls with memorials of the loyal and the brave, the gallant and the faithful, whose principles he loved, cherished and espoused; that he did not decline these memorials when tendered to him by men who were strangers to such feelings of pious affection—and that in many instances, *no doubt*, (Mr. Agar Ellis may have all the benefit of our comment upon this phrase,) he saved them from disgrace or destruction.

But, *the Furniture!* Is it not too ludicrous to suppose that the Keeper of the King's conscience could not fortify his own against the lures of an *emeritus* Buffet or a superannuated Bureau! that a suitor would attempt to seduce the Guardian of the Great Seal by the *beaux yeux* of a Commode, or the coquetry of a Corner Cupboard.

" Oh ! that such bulky Bribes as all might see,
Still, as of old, incumbered villany !—
A Statesman's slumbers how this speech would spoil !
' Sir, Spain has sent a thousand jars of Oil ;
Huge bales of British Cloth blockade the door ;
A hundred Oxen at your Levee roar.' "

One word more respecting Lord Dartmouth's *Notes* on Burnet—they abound in curious information. We are assured by Swift, though the praise is couched somewhat ironically, that the writer was full of good nature. "He treats his Clerks," says the caustic Dean, "with more civility and good manners than others in his station (Lord Privy Seal) have done the Queen." In spite of this commendation, from the severity with which not only the Bishop of Sarum himself, but almost every person whom Lord Dartmouth mentions, is handled, we should have supposed him not to be of the most indulgent temper. The Note, which Mr. Agar Ellis has cited, contains matter of *opinion*; it would have been only just to cite another from the same pen which contains matter of *fact*. But this would not have answered his purpose, for it completely establishes Lord Clarendon's innocence, and the wickedness of the faction which effected his overthrow.

"When they made some difficulty in the House of Commons of accusing him *without proof*, the last Earl of Carbery told them, if they would but impeach him, he would undertake to make out the fact afterwards: though I have heard him since say, *he did not know any one thing against him*, but knew he had so many enemies that he could never want assistance to make good what he said."—*Note by Lord Dartmouth on Burnet's History of his own time*, vol. i. p. 441. *Ed.* 1823.

To return to the veracious Pepys. Captain Cocke, at whose house he "was forced to get a bed" one night, told him, "my Lord Chancellor he minds getting of money and nothing else,"—can stronger proof be offered of the harpy talons of Lord Clarendon? especially when we call to mind the *Bulimiâ* for Gold under which Pepys himself laboured, and which must have well qualified him to judge of the symptoms of this disease in another. Mr. Henry Ellis, in his second Series of *Letters*, has printed two passages sufficiently illustrative of the *sacra fames* with which the Clerk of the Navy was beset. "Sure Pepys would value Lord Ossory's recommendation at no mean rate, though Eure and he together *neglect all where money chinks not*." "I know the *gripping temper* of both him (Pepys) and Eure, and what rates every poor boson (boatswain) pays for what he has purchased with his blood and many years' hardship."* But we need turn only to his own *Diary* for proofs of the pious gratitude with which Pepys acknowledges how successfully he made haste to get rich. In 1660, he blesses God for his first £100, he being not clearly worth £25 when he entered on office; in 1665, he accumulated £3,560; in the following year, £2,986, and found himself alto-

* Ellis's Original Letters, Second Series, vol. iv. 92.

gether very comfortably nestling upon no smaller a sum than £6,200. Yet this is the man who complains of Lord Clarendon for love of gain! On another occasion, Sir Hugh Cholmly informed him that he thought the Commons would "be revenged of my Lord Chancellor: and says, however, that he *thinks* there will be but two things proved on him, and one is, that he *may* have said to the King and to others words to breed in the King an ill opinion of the Parliament." Sir Hugh Cholmly's very temperate and measured *conjecture*, that it was *possible* the Chancellor *might, perhaps*, have expressed to the King an evil opinion of his turbulent Commons, on passing into Mr. Agar Ellis's receiver, is condensed into substantial proof. "It will be seen, by the first part of this extract, that the Chancellor HAD SPOKEN to the King against the Parliament." (p. 51.)

The next *testimony* of corruption is drawn from Anthony-à-Wood. We need not repeat the often told tale of this worthy Scribe's libel upon Lord Clarendon's memory, of his consequent banishment, deprivation and amercement, by the University of Oxford, and of the total absence of any authorities for his iniquitous statement. We prefer giving Mr. Agar Ellis's remarks upon this transaction. Wood's prejudices, he says, were all on the side of Clarendon; therefore, had not the evidence against him "been in his opinion peculiarly strong and clear and uncontrovertible, he *certainly* ("no doubt" again, under an alias,) would never have censured him." The Son of the Chancellor, for having avouched his father's innocence, is said to have excited a persecution against Wood, and is, on that account, represented, from Burnet, (who, Mr. Agar Ellis informs us, in another place, was a man of liberal principles and feelings, "*a great and rare merit in a Bishop!*") as splenetic and peevish, wanting in judgment, and swayed by vulgar prejudices and false notions; and Wood's solemn condemnation by his nursing mother is gravely affirmed to "strengthen" rather "than otherwise the belief in the truth of his accusations." Alas! for our simplicity! till better taught by Mr. Agar Ellis's forensic skill, we should have been likely to bring forward the record of the conviction of a libeller, especially if no justification had been pleaded, as in some degree corroborative of our innocence; when, in point of fact, it is directly otherwise, a distinct evidence of our guilt.

From Anthony-à-Wood we pass on to Andrew Marvell, a very good Patriot but a very bad Poet. Marvell has not spared Lord Clarendon in his rhymes,—and whom did he spare? We could select more pertinent extracts from this roughshod pony of Parnassus than Mr. Agar Ellis has chosen to present; but this

is not our business, and we shall content ourselves with one distich before us.

“ See how he reigns in his new palace culminant,
And sits in state divine, like Jove the fulminant.”

These lines plainly prove Lord Clarendon's “insolence,” as others do his “bribery, corruption, and avarice.” In our own days, a far better Poet, though we doubt if so good a Patriot as Marvell, has lampooned Chancellors, yea, and more than Chancellors; but it is not probable that Posterity will accept the portraits of the *Twopenny Postbag* as authentic representations of the Statesmen who swayed the Cabinet of England in the reign of George IV.

It was not long after the discovery of the Duke of York's marriage with Lord Clarendon's daughter, when Sir Charles Berkeley was beginning to circulate his base and unmanly calumny, that the King, pitying his faithful minister, who was well nigh overwhelmed with the complicated troubles into which he had been plunged, voluntarily presented him with a gift of £20,000. The facts are detailed so simply and artlessly by himself, (*Continuation*, &c. iii. 60,) that it is difficult to imagine how they could be drawn into an imputation against him. Pepys has recorded the issue of the warrant for this payment, and the use to which Clarendon applied it, namely, the discharge of a mortgage to the same amount, made by the King on Clarendon Park; which domain, still so encumbered, the King had given to Monck, and Monck had sold to Clarendon. Upon this subject Mr. Agar Ellis comments as follows. The Chancellor “bought the estate of Clarendon of the Duke of Albemarle, subject to a mortgage of £20,000, and then *made* the King give him the money to pay it off. Surely, if this is not a rapacious proceeding, it is difficult to say what comes under that denomination.”—(p. 76.) Surely, if this is not a grossly uncharitable misrepresentation, the pen of Zoilus was dipped in honey.

The Chancellor, it seems, having bought the estate, and paid off the mortgage through the King's bounty, felt a very unreasonable objection to have his timber upon it cut down for the use of the Navy; and most intolerantly complained that the chief agent in this agreeable transaction was his personal enemy, and the veriest Fanatic in England. By the help of Pepys once more, Mr. Agar Ellis, in reviewing the affair, establishes a very satisfactory case “of cautious corruption.” In the course of it, Lord Clarendon, after having been, as usual, “rapacious,” (for which we were prepared,) shows “ingratitude to the King,” and “base-ness” to the Admiralty Commissioners, whom, by “threats and intimidation,” he obliges “to abandon their duty for the purpose

of furthering his unlawful ends." O ye Gods! how many hard words are often expended uselessly in framing a Bill against a Culprit, which, after all, the Grand Jury must throw out as not a True one.

Respecting the sale of Dunkirk, we shall lay the conflicting evidence before our readers, for their own judgment and decision. When once plainly stated, we have very little fear respecting the conclusion to which it will lead them. And first, for the case against Lord Clarendon, as drawn up by Mr. Agar Ellis, following (though not avowedly) the steps of Harris.—Rapin affirms that Lord Clarendon proposed the bargain, negociated it, and concluded it. D'Estrades, the French *Plenipotentiary*, (as he is styled by Mr. Agar Ellis, though in reality he was sent to England without any official character at all, ostensibly on his way to Holland,) wrote to Louis XIV. that the Chancellor had told him,

"that the thought of this treaty came from him, and did not conceal that the necessity of the English affairs had inspired him with it. That the King, the Duke of York, and himself, were alone of this opinion; and that Monk, the Lord Treasurer, and the Earl of Sandwich, were still to be managed, who he could not hope to gain, but by the great sums which would accrue to the King: That having already proposed it to them from the urgent occasions of the state, they had offered an expedient to preserve the place for the King, and to ease him of this expense."—*Lettres, &c. du Comte d'Estrades*, vol. i., cited by Ellis, p. 93.

"These passages," remarks Mr. Agar Ellis, "are so conclusive as to the point of the Chancellor's having been the *inventor*, if it may be so termed, of the sale of Dunkirk, that it is surprising the fact should ever have been doubted by Historians." This surprise will probably vanish upon a reference to Clarendon's own account of the transaction. It is not often that we are admitted to so close an inspection of a Cabinet secret; nor are we frequently rendered so well able to determine in what manner the opinions of the several members of the Executive have been divided on an important National measure.

"The Lord Treasurer (Southampton), who was most troubled when money was wanted, had many secret conferences with the General (Monck), and with the best Seamen, of the benefit that accrued to the Crown by the keeping of Dunkirk, the constant charge and expense whereof amounted to above £120,000 yearly; and he found by them that it was a place of little importance. It is true that he had conferred of it with the Chancellor, with whom he held a fast friendship; *but found him so averse from it, that he resolved to speak with him no more till the King had taken some resolution*; and to that purpose he persuaded the General to go with him to the King and the Duke of York; telling them both, '*that the Chancellor must know nothing of it.*' And after several debates, the King thought it so counsellable a thing, that he

resolved to have it debated on before the Committee, which he trusted in his most secret affairs; and the Chancellor being then lame of the gout, he commanded that all these Lords should attend him at his house. Beside his Majesty himself and the Duke of York, there appeared the Lord Treasurer, the General, the Earl of Sandwich, the Vice-Chamberlain Sir George Carteret, who had been a great Commander at Sea, and the two Secretaries of State. *When the King entered the room with the Lord Treasurer, he desired his Majesty, smiling, 'That he would take the Chancellor's staff from him, otherwise he would break his head.'* When they were all sate, the King told him 'they were all come to debate an affair that *he knew he was against*, which was the parting with Dunkirk; but he did believe, when he had heard all that was said for it and against it, *he would change his mind*, as he himself had done.' And so the debate was entered into in this method, after enough was said of the straight the Crown was in, and what the yearly expense was."—*Continuation of the Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon*, vol. iii. p. 384.

He then details the arguments advanced in favour of the sale, which, in spite of the very natural unpopularity attached to it, (for it was considered a stain upon the National honour,) and of Clarendon's opposition, we are prepared to affirm was one of the few wise acts of the Second Charles's reign. Whether Clarendon changed his opinion or not, he does not state; but he very prudently forbore to resist that which he perceived was determined upon, and could not be prevented. His duty was so to guide the measure, that it should be productive of least ill,—or as others might think, of most good. It was still a matter of debate what party should have the refusal of this bargain,—the King of France, the King of Spain, or the United Provinces; and here plainly begins Clarendon's part in "proposing" the scheme, according to Rapin,—of "inventing" it, according to Mr. Agar Ellis. In this manner, as D'Estrades writes, did the "thought of the Treaty come from him." Clarendon saw the predominant advantages of negotiating with France; and although he does not expressly say that he suggested this disposal, no one who reads the arguments which he so strongly puts to that effect, can hesitate in believing that they are his own. He was appointed one of the Commissioners for the sale; and he executed this office, as he was bound to do, with a good grace, and very largely to his Master's advantage.

Is it possible that Mr. Agar Ellis has not read the passage which we have quoted above? If he has read it, can he have forgotten it? or can he venture (surely this is quite impossible) to doubt its truth? While all the parties were yet living, while the same King was yet on the throne, would Clarendon have dared (supposing such duplicity was not alien from every known transaction of his life, every visible feature of his character) to

palm such a tissue of circumstantial falsehoods upon his children, when it was certain of easy and immediate detection? to coin words for the King himself?—nay, (and can anything more expressly exhibit the stamp of Truth?) to record a *plaisanterie* which enlivened the debate of the Councillors? If we must not doubt the accuracy of D'Estrades's representation, (and we should most reluctantly impeach his veracity,) there is still a key to it. Might not Clarendon's averment to him be a diplomatic *ruse*, to whet the eagerness of France? And if their negociator was led to believe that a part of the English Ministry opposed the sale, might it not be supposed that he would be more ready to grant the price demanded, from fear of losing his bargain altogether? Are such practices unknown to the Morals of Diplomacy? We neither justify nor palliate them,—we deny their necessity, we mistrust their wisdom; but is there any member of any Cabinet or any Congress, from Richelieu to M. de Villele, from Wolsey to Lord Dudley, whose Political Conscience would be sufficiently tender to prompt their rejection?

We collect from Mr. Agar Ellis's statement, a little onward, that he agrees with us in thinking that the sale of Dunkirk was a prudent and beneficial act; but he contends that it was quite impossible that Clarendon could be sufficiently enlightened so to regard it. We have no means of adjusting the balance of Political wisdom between Lord Clarendon and Mr. Agar Ellis, for we are utterly ignorant of the amount of weight which the latter might be able to place in his own scale; but thus far we have the power of deciding,—that the arguments upon which Mr. Agar Ellis thinks the disposal of the Port *may* be supported, are precisely those upon which Lord Clarendon shows us that it *was* supported.

But to return to the main charge.

“The only satisfactory or intelligible explanation which can be given to his conduct under these circumstances is, that a portion of the money which the sale produced was to fall by agreement to his share. Without this, the sale of Dunkirk by him is an enigma which wants a key; and this key it is surely neither unnatural nor uncharitable to apply to it, after all the previous evidence to similar transactions we have just been reading.”—*Ellis's Historical Inquiries*, p. 101.

As Mr. Agar Ellis appeals to himself in behalf of his position, it is but fair to allow Lord Clarendon the same advantage.

“But whether the bargain was ill or well made, there could be no fault imputed to the Chancellor, who had no more to do in the transaction than is before set down, the whole matter having been so long deliberated and so fully debated. *Nor did he ever, before, or in, or after the transaction, receive the value of half-a-crown for reward or present, or*

any other consideration, relating to that affair. And the treatment he received after his coming into France, was evidence enough that that King never thought himself beholden to him."—*Continuation of the Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon*, vol. iii. p. 391.

This last argument is not without its force, when it is recollected that after his banishment, in the depth of a severe winter, when he was lying in bed dangerously ill, broken by disease, years and ingratitude, when the Physicians certified that he could not be removed from his chamber without manifest hazard of his life, the French Court refused him a resting place wherein, apparently, to lay his bones; and issued the most peremptory and repeated orders for his departure from their territory within a few hours. This "discourtesy," or rather, (to use another of his own expressions, more strong and equally just,) this "barbarity," did not seem to imply that Louis had any grateful recollection of Clarendon's administration of the Government of England, or that he had any debt of kindness which he felt himself called upon to discharge. And to this conclusion Mr. Agar Ellis might have arrived, even from the very Letter of D'Estrades, part of which he cites, if he had but pursued it to the end. No words can more strongly testify to the integrity of Clarendon than those with which he terminates:—" *Je dois aussi me plaindre du Chancelier, comme d'un homme qui aveuglément désire de procurer les avantages du Roi son Maître, sans entrer en aucune considération de ceux de Votre Majesté.*" It is to be hoped, after this plain declaration, that we shall never again hear that Lord Clarendon was bribed by France to procure the sale of Dunkirk.

Mr. D'Israeli has written an amusing Essay "On Palaces built by Ministers;"* and to this we may refer, as a less unfair representation of the circumstances attendant upon the erection of *Clarendon House*, than that given by Mr. Agar Ellis. We allude to it here more particularly, in order to refute one other calumny which the Chancellor's enemies advanced at the time; which, strange to say, has escaped the more than Epidaurian vision of Mr. Agar Ellis, and which Mr. D'Israeli, with his usual good humour and good sense, treats as a malicious suggestion;—namely, that Lord Clarendon "had persuaded Charles II. to marry the Infanta of Portugal, knowing (but how he obtained that knowledge his enemies have not revealed) that the Portuguese Princess was not likely to raise any obstacle to the inheritance of his own daughter to the throne." How, indeed, this knowledge was to be obtained it belongs not to us to determine; but this much we are sure of, that if the information was so given, it was palpably false, for, as any common History will show, the

* *Curiosities of Literature*, New Series, ii. 236.

Queen was twice declared pregnant. The King himself told Dr. Burnet that she had been with child; and Dr. Willis, the Court Physician, bore testimony to a miscarriage.

We know not whether most to admire the charity or the logic of the following passage.

"The Chancellor called it Clarendon House; but the malicious public affixed the name of *Dunkirk House* to it, as if it had been built with the money proceeding from the sale of that place. Others also called it *Holland House*, upon the *supposition* that the Chancellor had received bribes from the Dutch."—

Why is it here omitted that it was called *Tungier House*? The very vagueness of the names shows the futility of the charge.

—"Whether Clarendon House was erected with French or Dutch money, or with both, it is impossible for us at this distance of time, with the slender evidence upon the subject we possess, to decide. After, however, all that has been *previously brought forward* with respect to the *corruption* of the Chancellor upon the subject of Dunkirk, the question of whether he erected his house with the money so received, is not of much importance in any way to either his fame or his character. *If* he received money from the sale of Dunkirk, (and we have seen very sufficient grounds to believe that such was the case,) *it is equally probable* he did from the Dutch; and that he employed these means in erecting a mansion, which his own finances would not otherwise have allowed him to undertake, is also *equally probable*. But our belief in this must rest very mainly upon evidence as to his general-character; as the Chancellor himself must necessarily have been the only person who could exactly know from what source the funds were drawn, with which he built his house."—*Ellis's Historical Inquiries*, p. 107, 108.

We pass now to the second division of Mr. Agar Ellis's indictment; in which it would be equally easy to show, in detail, that the evidence upon which he seeks to establish "the cruelty and tyranny" of Lord Clarendon, is nearly allied to that whereon he has rested the imputation of "rapacity and corruption." But we shall forbear from this close method of investigation. It generally saves much trouble, in all matters of controversy, to turn, in the first instance, to premisses rather than to conclusions,—to begin at the beginning, instead of reading backward, as in a Witch's Prayer or a Hebrew Psalter. Mr. Agar Ellis's superstructure may be determined from his groundwork; and a few of his leading tenets, on matters connected with Ecclesiastical History, will enable our readers to anticipate the deductions which he makes from them.

His grand authority and standard book of reference, on these points, is Neal's *History of the Puritans*, which we hesitate not to pronounce is the most rancorous, the most unfair, and the least trustworthy production that ever issued from the Sectarian

Press. It is here characterized as “written with considerable ability, and, considering the circumstances of the author, with *surprising impartiality*.” Before Mr. Agar Ellis again quotes Neal, we entreat him, for his own sake, to turn, if it be but for half a dozen pages, to the Volumes of Bishop Maddox and Dr. Grey.

The Corporation Act and the Act of Uniformity are the two leading objects against which Mr. Agar Ellis directs his artillery; and the *Declaration from Breda* is advanced, as usual, as a pledge on the part of Charles's Government, that there should be no interference with Religion. The *Declaration from Breda*, on the contrary, bears on its face a distinct avowal that the settlement of Religion shall be made one of the first objects of the deliberation of Parliament—that statutes shall be enacted to regulate Ecclesiastical Polity; and that the wisdom of the Great Council shall be directed to the establishment of sound doctrine and discipline in the Church. “*In the mean time*, that nobody should be punished or questioned for continuing the exercise of his Religion in the way he had been accustomed to in the late confusions.” What can these words “in the mean time” intend, but, that, after that time, be it what it may, has passed, inquiry shall be instituted? We are not here arguing, for it is unnecessary so to do, on the justice or the policy of these Acts. Different men, according to the different value which they place upon a Church Establishment, will always regard them with different eyes; and we, who hold that without such an Establishment—*Ichabod*—our glory has passed away,—shall never be wanting, in fitting times and places, to maintain both their necessity and their wisdom. At present, we are only concerned to show that the Ministers of Charles, by enacting them, fulfilled, instead of violating, the assurance which had been given before the Restoration. The proceedings in the Meeting at the Savoy sufficiently explain the final objects of those who contended most loudly for the continuance of *free trade* and *universal suffrage* in Religion. How long would either the Mitre or the Crown have retained its but newly recovered brightness, if such men as Clarendon had not been found to stand in the gap and stop the contagion of levelling schismatics, who professed that it was not lawful to impose things indifferent, by authority, and who cautiously employed the word *Nation* instead of *Kingdom*, lest they might thereby appear openly to acknowledge a *King*!

It is to Clarendon—the unprincipled, rapacious, profligate, arbitrary, tyrannical, corrupt, cruel, arrogant, harsh, relentless, barbarous, intolerant, oppressive, and unconstitutional Clarendon—the epithets are all culled from Mr. Agar Ellis—that we owe

the existence of a single barrier in favour of the liberty of the subject, after the Restoration. It was his hand which gently stemmed the drunken loyalty of the nation staggering to its own overthrow. But for him, the Petition of Rights—the Bill for Triennial Parliaments—the Habeas Corpus Act itself—all would have been thrown overboard as so much useless ballast, encumbering the vessel now she was once in Port. The Courts of High Commission and the Star Chamber, would have been revived without difficulty. Shipmoney, Tonnage, and Poundage might have been levied without reluctance, and the Prerogative might have been stretched and expanded into the most gigantic dimensions. That Clarendon prevented these inroads upon Freedom was a crime which the oligarchy, by which his fall was worked, sedulously pressed upon the attention and remembrance of the would-be-despot, to whose conspiracy against the Constitution they lent their iniquitous aid. For this offence Charles never forgave him; and he affected to consider the uncorrupted faith which this great Minister had preserved to his Country as a breach of fidelity to himself. Posterity has done ample justice to both parties. Each succeeding document, which, from time to time, has been brought forward illustrative of the History of this reign, has confirmed the infamy of the “bad man and bad king”—*unâ virtute redemptus*, the good-humour which has served him as impenetrable mail,—while it has added increasing lustre to the reputation of Clarendon. Mr. Agar Ellis is still unconvinced. But we believe that he dislikes Bishops and Chancellors by wholesale; and, perhaps, the faults to which he objects will be found to exist in Church and State themselves rather than in their administrators. Against his opinion we may advance that of one who knew, at least, as much of the Constitution of his Country, and loved it—shall we say? more—Mr. Speaker Onslow. He comments, in the following words, upon that which we have just stated to have been the policy of Clarendon’s administration. “If it is true of him, how much are we all indebted to him! That he did this great and lasting service to his Country, HAS BEEN AND IS THE UNIVERSAL PERSUASION.”

“*Quique sui memores alios fecere merendo.*”

Mr. Agar Ellis concludes with three *minor* charges against Lord Clarendon, namely, that he was an assassin, a hypocrite, and an infidel.

“They are, his encouragement of the attempts to assassinate Cromwell; the act he passed upon the subject of the religion of Charles II.; and the blasphemous comparison he makes in his History in speaking of the execution of the first Charles. The first will tend to show how little scrupulous he was of the means he employed to compass his ends—the se-

cond displays in its full perfection the crooked policy of the thorough-paced politician—while the third gives us some notion of the degree of respect for religion entertained by this pretended patron of the Protestant faith.

“We find abundant proofs in the collection of the Clarendon State Papers, published at Oxford in 1786, of the connivance of the Chancellor in the bloody designs of some of the more unprincipled cavaliers to murder Cromwell. Indeed, it appears that a regular account of the proceedings of these ruffians was sent to him, and that they were incited by him to persevere in them. *It is not by any means impossible that he may even have been himself the author of some of these brilliant schemes.*”

“The death, by natural means, of Oliver Cromwell, on the 3d of September, 1658, prevented the Chancellor from assisting in the perpetration of the crime, which it is proved by these documents, he had concurred in meditating. The guilt of intention, however, rests with him in the clearest and most satisfactory manner.”—pp. 163—165. 173—175.

It has been broadly asserted, that both the Royal Brothers, in common with most of the Cavaliers, favoured these detestable schemes of assassination. That the Duke of York, conceived then to be *justifiable*, is too clear from his own Letter to the King, of May 14, 1665, printed in Thurloe’s *State Papers*, (i. 666.) But respecting Clarendon, we have never seen any evidence adduced which can include him within this guilty knowledge and participation; and certainly that which is brought forward by Mr. Agar Ellis fails to substantiate the charge. If it is to be asserted, that Lord Clarendon prompted or even approved the designs of Titus and Saxby, because they were communicated to him by Letter; on the same grounds Mr. Fox may be said to have been accessory to a similar nefarious proposition against the First Consul of France; and one of the most generous acts of a mind which was never wanting in generosity, may be tortured into a foul imputation. Not a syllable exists in reply from Lord Clarendon to the statements of Titus. No encouragement appears to have been offered to him; and, perhaps, after all, (like the agent of Buonaparte,) he was a double villain; and, in accordance with the character given of him by Swift as “the greatest rogue in England,” he might, in this very proposal, be employed by Cromwell, as a tool, to cast odium on the Royalists, if they had listened to his advice. The utmost that can be urged against Clarendon is an offence to which, if it be one, we for ourselves must also plead guilty; a sincere admiration which he expressed by letter of the inimitable Prefatory address to the Tract of *Killing no Murder*; than which no choicer specimen of gravely sustained irony can be produced in our language. But this by no means involves a serious approval of the doctrines so perversely founded on Scriptural arguments in the body of that very singular Pamphlet. Of Clarendon’s innocence in this respect Warburton entertained

no doubt. When speaking of the Duke of York's Letter to which we have just alluded, and of the assassination plots encouraged by the Royal Family, he adds, "Why so little was known of it, I suppose, proceeded from Chancellor Hyde's abhorrence of it."

To the second charge, that "at the time of the Restoration Clarendon was *certainly aware* that Charles II. was a Roman Catholic;" and, therefore, had he been the good Protestant he affected to be—had he had the welfare of the Reformed Religion, or, indeed, of the Country, as much at heart as he professed, so far from assisting to restore Charles, he would have insisted on his being excluded,—it may be sufficient to reply, that Charles was not reconciled to the Church of Rome till on his death-bed—that up to that time it is quite plain his profession, at least, was Protestant, and, therefore, that if Clarendon had been "*certainly aware*" of his apostasy, four and twenty years before it occurred, he would have been egregiously deceived.

On the third and last point, the injudicious and indecorous comparison of the martyrdom of Charles I. with the death and passion of our Saviour, we fully join in reprobation,—but not with Mr. Agar Ellis. Clarendon's words are these, that the execution of Charles was "the most execrable murder that was ever committed since that of our blessed Saviour." Mr. Agar Ellis's comment is to the following effect, that had Clarendon been a pious man he certainly never would have made such a remark; that it shows either a most perverted intellect, or the grossest ignorance of the Religion of the New Testament; and that, in conjunction with the whole tenor of his life, it leads us to doubt whether he was a sincere Christian. In our estimation, the passage is far more offensive to good taste than to Piety; one in the castigation of which Religion is less concerned than Criticism. In the overflowing of his feelings the noble Author has been betrayed into a most unmeasured hyperbole; and seeking for expressions which might be adequate to the swelling of his heart, he has unhappily borrowed from materials, inviolable, unapproachable, inconvertible to other subjects. His loyalty to his King was a principle reigning in him with strength only second to that of his devotion to God;—*Cui nihil viget simile aut secundum*—and, in the present instance, he has lost sight of their necessary distinction, and allowed them, in the fervour of his grief, to coalesce and mingle imperceptibly with each other. Need we recall to the reader's memory the touching incident on the morning of Charles's suffering, wherein he himself showed a nicer discrimination than his Minister has done? Bishop Juxon, at the King's desire, before he left St. James's, for the last act of his Tragedy, read to him a portion of Scripture.—It was the 27th chapter of St. Matthew. Charles thanked him,

but objected to the *selection*, for such he thought it was. By a most remarkable coincidence it was the first Lesson in the course of the Church Service for the morning.

The character of the great Statesman whom we have thus rescued from a posthumous enemy, not less virulent and bitter than any of those whom he encountered while living, has been so repeatedly drawn by others, that we have little occasion or even wish to add a new panegyric. Let it be studied in his own writings, in the History of his times, in the general judgment of posterity. It belongs to our great stock of glory as a People, and forms part, and no inconsiderable part of our Bank of National Honour; and we indignantly resist any attempt to diminish it, as a robbery of our public, hereditary, ancestral, unalienable possessions. How depraved must be that appetite for calumny which would uncere the dead in the foul hope of glutting on corruption! How rich must be the embalmment, how fragrant the perfume of a good name, which still breathes from the tomb, and preserves the deposit entrusted to it, unharmed by the nibbling, crawling, slime-bred, venomous broods, which greedily await, and willingly would accelerate the loathsome processes of decay.

We turn with pleasure from Mr. Agar Ellis's little livid octavo to the full-sized and fair-spoken quartos with which Mr. Singer has increased our Historical stores. More than half a century ago, in 1763, Bishop Douglas gave to the world the Correspondence of Henry Earl of Clarendon, eldest son of the great Chancellor, together with his Diary. The collection was published from papers, at that time, in the possession of Richard Powney, Esq., High Steward of Maidenhead, who had purchased them from Mr. Richards of Wokingham; to whose Father, Bryan Richards, a nephew of Lady Clarendon, they had been given by the third Earl. The Letters were printed from copies by the writer himself, the Diary from an autograph also, with the exception of the portion relating to 1688, which was taken from a copy collated with the original; that original having shared the fate of many other valuable MSS., namely, having been *borrowed* and not returned. From the *original* Correspondence now in the hands of Mr. Upcote, of the Royal Institution, certain *lacunæ* in Bishop Douglas's impression have been supplied, and a few corrections made; and there are now added, for the first time, the Correspondence of Lawrence Earl of Rochester, (the Chancellor's second Son,) with many distinguished personages; his Diary during an Embassy to John Sobieski, King of Poland, and some other papers relative to matters of considerable interest.

Concerning that portion of the Correspondence which has been so long known, it is scarcely necessary for us to speak. From

the remainder a few passages may be set apart for extraction, and, in some instances, for brief comment.

It is well known that Monmouth, while under sentence of death, repeatedly urged that he had a secret of the uttermost importance to the King's interests to communicate. The following Letter was written to Lord Rochester, urging him to procure an interview with the King, which, to the eternal disgrace of James, afterwards took place, without moving him to pity.

"From Ringwood, the 9th of July, 1685.

"My Lord,—Having had some proofs of your kindness when I was last at Whitehall, makes me hope now that you will not refuse interceding for me with the King, being I now, though too late, see how I have been misled; were I not clearly convinced of that, I would rather die a thousand deaths than say what I do. I writ yesterday to the King, and the chief business of my letter was to desire to speak to him, for I have that to say to him that I am sure will set him at quiet for ever; I am sure the whole study of my life shall hereafter be how to serve him; and I am sure that which I can do is more worth than taking my life away; and I am confident, if I may be so happy to speak to him, he will himself be convinced of it, being I can give him such infallible proofs of my truth to him, that though I would alter, it would not be in my power to do it. This which I have now said, I hope will be enough to encourage your Lordship to show me your favour, which I do earnestly desire of you, and hope that you have so much generosity as not to refuse it. I hope, my Lord, and I make no doubt of it, that you will not have cause to repent having saved my life, which I am sure you can do a great deal in it, if you please; being it obliges me for ever to be entirely yours, which I shall ever be as long as I have life.

"MONMOUTH."

"For the Earl of Rochester, Lord High Treasurer of England."

Monmouth, on finding that his supplications were ineffectual, and that he only drew down upon himself additional reproach, is said to have left the presence haughtily. But the love of life once more prevailed, and he again wrote to his Uncle a letter which, as the following narrative found among the Clarendon papers relates, never reached the Royal hand. Mr. Fox has doubted this story; but the statement given below wears marks of authenticity. Colonel Scott was of the Buccleuch Family. The Captain not named is believed to have been the infamous Blood, who probably betrayed the Letter to Sunderland. Of Mr. Bowdler nothing is known.

"In the year 1734, I was in company with Colonel Scott, at Boulogne-sur-Mer, in France, when the Colonel called me to him, and said, 'Mr. Bowdler, you are a young man and I am an old one, I will tell you something worth remembering. When the Duke of Monmouth was

in the Tower, under sentence of death, I had the command of the guard there, and one morning the Duke desired me to let him have pen, ink, and paper, for he wanted to write to the King. He wrote a very long letter, and when he had sealed it, he desired me to give him my word of honour that I would carry that letter to the King, and deliver it into no hands but his. I told him I would most willingly do it if it was in my power, but that my orders were not to stir from him till his execution; and therefore I dared not leave the Tower. At this he expressed great uneasiness, saying, he could have depended on my honour: but at length asked me if there was any officer in that place on whose fidelity I could rely. I told him that Capt. ——— was one on whom I would willingly confide, in any thing on which my own life depended, and more I could not say of any man. The Duke desired he might be called. When he was come, the Duke told him the affair; he promised on his word and honour that he would deliver the letter to no person whatever, but to the King only. Accordingly he went immediately to Court, and being come near the door of the King's closet, took the letter out of his pocket to give it to the King. Just then Lord Sunderland came out of the closet, and seeing him, asked what he had in his hand; he said it was a letter from the Duke of Monmouth, which he was going to give to the King. Lord Sunderland said, "Give it to me, I will carry it to him." "No, my Lord," said the Captain, "I pawned my honour to the Duke that I would deliver the letter to no man but the King himself." "But," said Lord Sunderland, "the King is putting on his shirt, and you cannot be admitted into the closet, but the door shall stand so far open that you shall see me give it to him." After many words, Lord Sunderland prevailed on the Captain to give him the letter, and his Lordship went into the closet with it. — After the Revolution, Colonel Scott, who followed the fortunes of King James, going one day to see the King at dinner, at St. Germain's, in France, the King called him to him, and said, "Colonel Scott, I have lately heard a thing that I want to know from you whether it is true." The King then related the story, and the Colonel assured him that what His Majesty had been told was exactly true. Upon which the King then said, "Colonel Scott, as I am a living man, I never saw that letter, nor did I ever hear of it till within these few days." — vol. i. pp. 144, 145.

Instances of want of feeling in James are by no means new. The unconcern with which, in the Letter printed below, he passes from the calamity of the sufferers in the *Gloucester* to public affairs of no deep interest, is a manifest proof of his selfishness, and it leaves us with a strong impression, that Burnet's statement that the Duke's care for his Dogs and Priests occasioned the loss of many of his gallant shipmates, is very little, if at all, overcharged.

"From James Duke of York to Lord Treasurer (Hyde.)

"Edinburgh, May 9, 1682.

"I had not time yesterday to write to you by the flying packet myself, to have told you of the unfortunate loss of the *Gloucester*, but charged Churchill to do it; so that I shall say no more of it, but to

assure you myself, that I am really troubled for the loss of your brother James. Really he would have made a very good man ; for besides other good qualities, he was as unconcerned as any man I ever saw, and all they who got off after me say the same thing. I have now had an account of the loss of the ship's company, and find there were about one hundred and ten lost, besides those who belonged to me, and those who came with me ; how many they were I do not yet know. I was yesterday at Council, where I acquainted them with the choice his Majesty had made of his great officers, and gave those that were present their warrants, which I took out of my strong box when the ship struck, and put them in my pocket, and so they escaped being wet. Before I went to Council, I told Lord Athol what was his Majesty's pleasure, who received it with that submission as became a loyal subject, for he did not appear at all displeased ; and I really believe he sees it is better for him not to have been Chancellor, so that that affair is very well over ; and I have something to propose to his Majesty in his favour, when I come to Windsor, which will cost his Majesty nothing, and be a kindness to him. As for the affair of the disorder which happened in this town before I came, it will, I believe, be settled on Thursday next, at Council, for his Majesty's advantage, and the further securing the town from any such accident for the time to come ; and by Sunday next I hope to have dispatched all the affairs which require my stay here, so that by Monday I may have all things ready to go on ship board ; the rest of the frigates which had lost company came in this day into Leith Road. I long to hear whether any thing has been done in the affair Sir Robert Holmes proposed, though I cannot expect it till I see you."—vol. i. p. 67—69.

Lord Rochester's daughter Anne was married to Lord Ossory, grandson of James first Duke of Ormond. She is described as having been very pretty and agreeable in her person, of abundant vivacity, ready wit and excellent temper. She died in childbed, about eighteen months after her marriage, perhaps a victim to some impression upon an over-sensitive Imagination. Hough, afterwards Bishop of Worcester, has recorded two instances of this painful susceptibility. The first relates to the once general and now vulgar superstition of sitting down in company with the inauspicious number thirteen. The other is a dream soon after the death of her Sister the Countess of Kildare. Lady Ossory, who was only seventeen, dreamed that some one knocked at her chamber door. The servant not answering, she opened it herself, and saw a lady muffled up in a hood. This being drawn aside, the stranger proved to be Lady Kildare. Upon this she cried out, "Sister, is it you, what makes you come in this manner?" "Don't be frightened," replied she, "for I am come on a very serious affair, and it is to tell you that you will die very soon." Lord Rochester was severely affected by her loss ; and we find in these pages some *Meditations* on the first anniversary of her de-

cease, which do equal credit to his piety and his affection. They are too long for citation; but we may present our readers with the following beautifully framed letter on the same subject from the pen of the Duke of Ormond. It is a model for one of the most difficult species of composition, a Letter of condolence; and it is so for this plain reason, that it comes from and speaks to the heart.

“Dublin, Jan. 23, 1684-85.

“If I had had the courage and composure of mind, your Lordship should have received the sad cause of your affliction at once; but besides my part of the sorrow that belongs to our common and equal loss, which made me unfit to write, methinks I have something like guilt upon me, our misfortune happening whilst what was so dear to us was under my care and trust. I have had many and some like inflictions of this nature, most justly laid upon me, for which I was in hope to receive some reparation by your daughter: God’s will be done, and humbly submitted to. This is, I think, the first, I am sure the greatest you have felt; and I can tell you nothing but time, with all other assistances, can relieve you; and that I hope you have largely before you. I have caused the body to be deposited where I have two sons laid, but with your Lordship’s leave it is my purpose to have it removed to the vault of my family, when those of it that lie in Westminster can be gotten thither. If I knew how to express greater kindness and esteem for all that remains of her here below, I would certainly do it. Her marriage to my grandson did not create our friendship, it was established before; nor shall her death dissolve or diminish it on my part, but I shall be still as much as ever, your Lordship’s most faithful, and

“Most humble Servant,

“ORMOND.”

The Diary of the Polish embassy is amusing from its detail of Diplomatic perplexities, and of the numerous petty shifts and expedients to which the Envoys of those times were compelled to resort, in order that they might not give the *pas* to the Representative of another Power; perplexities which we perceive, from the recently published *Memoires* of M. le Comte de Segur, continued to exist almost down to our own day. Mr. Hyde’s mission took place in 1676, while the King of Poland was in the field against the Turks and Tartars. During Mr. Hyde’s stay, and in great measure by his means, a Peace very advantageous to Poland was concluded. The Ambassador, on his return, was ordered to proceed to the Imperial Court, to condole on the death of the Empress; but finding the Emperor Leopold *married again before his arrival*, he proceeded to join the negotiators on a larger scale at Nimeguen.

The first difficulty to be overcome regarded the Envoy from Muscovy. This Minister, who was “a brave portly man,” sent to know when Mr. Hyde would receive him; for he had not been

invited on account of the disputes between Ambassadors and Envoys "about the hand."

"I answered, that if he pleased to do me that favour, I was ready at any time he would to receive it; but I thought fit to advertise him of one thing, which I thought he could not be ignorant of, in relation to his reception, that I could not give him the right hand in my house, which was a general rule from Ambassadors to all Envoys; and therefore I hoped he would not take it ill. The man that came could not understand me; but I took the best care I could by an interpreter, to make him apprehend it; and to that end repeated it two or three times: so I thought I should hear no more of him; but within a quarter of an hour, he was himself at my door, took no notice of my message, but yielded the hand without disputing it, and so we sat down."—vol. i. p. 595.

Next Mr. Hyde drives with break-neck speed to the French Ambassador's house, in order that he may alight before the Papal Nuncio, whose carriage he perceived on the same errand. For the nonce he escapes collision with this limb of Antichrist, but a few hours afterwards, unhappily, he encounters him in a visit to the Treasurer. "The Treasurer went out to meet him, and brought him into the room where my Lady and I was; I know not whether by chance or no. So I was embarrassed again, but every body stood up some time, and when the Treasurer spoke to us to sit down, I came away, and so *I hope I did no harm by this ceremony*. Thus have I been haunted twice by the Pope to-day." Soon after, he sets out in company with M. de Bethune (the French Ambassador) to the army at Leopold. They travelled very amicably in the same coach, "sometimes lying together in the same barn, and sometimes in several, if there happened to be two," till within half a league of the town, when Mr. Hyde took leave, under pretence that he must wait for one of his waggons, which was not yet come up; "but the truth was, that I was not willing to enter the town with him, which was a public place, for fear of something that might fall out which might turn to my prejudice; and I hope that hitherto in this journey nothing hath: and so we parted upon the plain field. And I stopped there almost half an hour," (mark well, it was in Russia, on the evening of the 22d of October, with hordes of Tartars marauding on all sides,) "and sent one into town for a house. And in the mean time all the French train was got in, so that we were as if we had never been together." On his arrival he sent excuses to his former companion for not coming to see him that night, on account of weariness and the ill weather, and received a reply to the same purpose.

On the following Sunday Mr. Hyde sent to the Palatine of Culmen, to say that he would visit him. The Palatine required

a quarter of an hour's respite to dress himself, which Mr. Hyde accorded. He proved a wonderfully civil, well-bred man, but Mr. Hyde was glad enough when the compliments were over, because they were all in Latin on both sides, and "he had no interpreter," an officer which it might be thought an ambassador would scarcely need, when such a language was the medium of communication. But we must remember that these were times in which a Secretary of State was deemed sufficiently qualified for his office, if he could speak French and write short-hand.* The next morning was spent in writing out a detailed account of the journey with M. de Bethune, to be sent to Mr. Secretary Williamson, but he afterwards thought it more prudent to keep it by him for his justification, if necessary. On walking to the Camp with M. de Bethune, care was taken that sometimes one, sometimes the other, should be on the right hand; but Mr. Hyde admits that he was "in the briars" the whole way. He went first into the General's Tent, and afterwards came M. de Bethune. "I stayed at the upper end of the table, and he at the other end over against me, so *I hope I lost nothing here.*"

Mr. Hyde had not yet been admitted to an audience of the King, but an opportunity occurred, during a cessation of arms, of seeing both the hostile camps; and the English Ambassador, in order to gratify his curiosity, resolved to visit them, incognito, as a friend of M. de Bethune, who had been invited thither; and as on this occasion occurred the most serious of all his dilemmas, we must give it at length.

"The King had sent out the Chevalier Lubomirski to compliment me upon the way, but Monsieur de Bethune sending to the King that I came as a private man, and desired not to be taken notice of, that went for nothing; and when I came into the King's tent, as I did in the dirty equipage I was, just as I alighted from my horse, I told him that being as near as Leopold, I was very desirous to come to make my compliment to him, upon the dangers he had escaped, and the glorious peace he had made, and to see one of the places where he had done wonders; for which he thanked me; and not a word of the King nor Ambassador. A little after being gone out for air, for I never felt a hotter day in August, Abbot Brunetti came to me, and told me the King had a mind to have us all dine with him; and that though he knew, that as Ambassadors, Monsieur de Bethune and I could not meet, yet being I would be looked on here as none, he thought we might; and that he came to propose this expedient:—that I should let one or two of the Senators sit above me, which would put the thing out of all manner of consequence. I was a little cold at stomach upon this overture; but finding that I had been with the King already as no Ambassador; that I had made no mention of the King, nor of the christening; that I had come the journey

* General Monck of Secretary Nicholas.

as none, by letting all my equipage come immediately after the French Ambassador's; I thought it was not good to be uneasy to the King here, and the more that I yielded in every thing, it made me still the more a private man, which I was to be absolutely, or not at all: and so I told the Abbot that the King was master, that I came not to create him difficulties, and that he should order it as he pleased; with which they were infinitely satisfied. And I think it was better than desiring to be excused, and have dined apart, which would have looked as if I took myself to have something of an Ambassador, and would have made Monsieur de Bethune have valued the marching before me on the road; and if I were nothing but a private man, the senators were to sit before me: these were my considerations; and to be short, so it was, both Monsieur de Bethune, Prince Radzivil, and the Count de Maligny sat before me, and two or three other Palatines after me."—vol. i. pp. 619, 620.

We have not mentioned that Mr. Hyde was accompanied by Dr. South, as his Chaplain. He found him of great use in Latin, in which language, as we have before seen, and as he does not scruple to confess, he "was not very good." But South appears not to have been very easy of control. He would never adopt the Russian style in computing time, but went on in his Religious Offices, like the orthodox Glastonbury thorn, sturdily adhering to the day of the month, which was set down in his own Calendar. During the visit to the Camp, which we have just recounted, South, according to his own wish, was left behind; and on the Ambassador's return the following amusing scene occurred.

"Dr. South, I had forgot to say, upon the choice I gave him of going or not going, had chosen the latter, upon the pretence of apprehending the inconveniences of the journey, which he said he had not a constitution to bear. I had left several others of my family behind too, with some money, but with credit more, with a merchant's man to whom I had bills; so that there could be no apprehension of want: but when I returned to Leopold, I found a visible alteration in the Doctor's temper, whether it were that he was troubled he had not gone the journey, when he saw us all come back alive, which perhaps he was afraid of; or whether he was dissatisfied the cook was not left behind to dress his victuals, or that another at least was not got, which I had not time to give order for; or whatever the hidden cause was,—feeding upon his own ill-natured spleen for four days together, or, as Horace says, *an minxerit in patrios cineres, certè furit*. And first, though he looked out of the window and saw me come in, I was above an hour in the house before he came down to me, and I sent at last for him; he came, but in much disorder, making short questions, and sometimes as short answers, of all which I endeavoured to take as little notice as it was possible; but treated him with all the gentleness possible; made him excuses for not providing a cook, but that I hoped he knew the difficulty of getting such a creature in this country; to which he answered well enough: but there was gall and bitterness round about, and I could not sweeten it, and took no more pains. Quickly after supper he left me, and I went to bed; my people

telling me, that both his man as well as he were mightily out of humour; and that when they were ever left alone, his man did usually heat him with some jealousy or tittle-tattle."—vol. i. p. 622.

Finally, at Nimeguen certain difficulties arose about receiving and paying visits distinctly or *en corps*, and the public notification of arrival. By the dexterity of My Lord Ambassador Jenkins these obstacles were happily overcome.

The two most curious Letters contained in the Second Volume are a short invitation from the Prince of Orange (William III.) on his descent, to Lord Dartmouth, who commanded the Fleet at Portsmouth, and the Earl's reply. They strongly prove the truth of some particulars, hitherto known only through Dalrymple (*Memoirs, Appendix*, p. 314), of a hazardous negotiation in which Mr. Byng was engaged. It is probable that the Prince of Orange wrote originally in French, and that the translation here given was made by his command. We doubt whether he was sufficiently master of English to write even these few lines in that language, and all the rest of his correspondence, of which there are many detached pieces in these volumes, is carried on in French.

" November 29, 1688.

" My Lord,—The Protestant religion and the liberties of England being now at stake, I cannot believe you will contribute towards the destruction of either: I therefore send you this letter, to invite you earnestly to join the fleet under your command with mine, and to declare, as I have done in my Declaration, for the religion and liberties. It will be an act so commendable, that it will not only oblige me for ever to be your friend, but even to study which way I may show my kindness to you in the most particular manner. I expect and desire you to consider well of this my proposition and advice, and that I may speedily receive the news of your compliance, which will make me

" Your affectionate friend,

(Copy.)

" PRINCE DE ORANGE."

" Resolution, at Spithead, December 12, 1688.

" May it please your Highness,—Out of duty to my country and the reformed religion of the Church of England, (which, as I am, I have always professed myself a true son of,) I embrace readily the fair invitation given me by your Highness's particular letter of the 29th of November (come just now to my hands) to dispose the fleet under my command to join with your Highness's, and concur in the good ends you have hitherto pursued with so much vigour and success towards the supporting our religion, laws, liberties, and properties; not doubting, according to your Highness's declarations, but you will prosecute the same with the utmost regard and tenderness to the person and safety of the King my master, whose just commands all his Majesty's subjects (but men of honour especially under his commission and pay) are bound to execute; and among that number I held myself very particularly obliged: but to my great amazement (which I cannot but tell your Highness with

great confusion and grief of heart) I understand, just this moment, that his Majesty hath sent away the Queen and Prince of Wales (contrary not only to my advices but earnest endeavours to prevent), and is resolved to withdraw himself, which (on a firm belief of your Highness's just duty and care for him) I cannot apprehend his Majesty can have any reason to do, otherwise than that he is not willing to be a witness of, or consent to, what the laws and a free Parliament (which myself and the fleet addressed for eleven or twelve days ago) shall inflict on his evil advisers, who have put the kingdom into that ferment, which has invited your Highness to come and expose your person for re-establishing it, and rooting out of the government all Papist officers, as well military as civil.

"I have well deliberated on your Highness's most merciful proceedings hitherto, in preventing the effusion of Christian blood, and do believe it not only a just but commendable act, to join with your Highness in acquiring your declared purposes, which I promise to do heartily, and to that end will purge the fleet of all Papist officers immediately.

"I do farther promise solemnly to your Highness, to do my utmost to prevent any French forces landing, or making any descent on these kingdoms, and doing every thing (like a true Protestant of the Church of England, and lover of my country) that may conduce to the safety of the King and his kingdoms, and the religion, laws, and liberties thereof, by all such means and counsels as to your Highness and the kingdom shall seem meet; and in full reliance thereon, I put myself, and the fleet of England, under your Highness's gracious protection. So that both fleets being at your Highness's disposal, in the joining whereof, and the time you think best and necessary, I doubt not but you will have a just regard that no distastes may be given, that either may be liable to, I hope to receive your directions by the bearer, Captain Aylmer, who is my very good friend, and is entirely devoted to your Highness, being a firm Protestant and an honest man: to him I pray your Highness will be referred for many particulars, as well in relation to the fleet as the garrison of Portsmouth, too long to trouble your Highness with here, humbly submitting all concerns to your Highness's better judgment, as becomes,

"May it please your Highness,

"Your Highness's most obedient humble Servant,

"DARTMOUTH."

(Copy.)

"To his Highness the Prince of Orange,
most humbly."

Our last extract will relate to a matter of less public nature than those with which we have hitherto been concerned. It is a Letter from the learned, high-minded, and munificent Fleetwood, on resigning his Tutorship to Lord Rochester's Son. It breathes a spirit of integrity and independence well worthy of imitation; and which it is not a little agreeable to remember, afterwards met its due reward. We wish one of Fleetwood's labours, before his translation from St. Asaph to Ely, were more generally known. A reprint of his *Life and Miracles of St. Wenefrede* would be no unseasonable offering to the present days.

“ Eton College, March 19, 1686-87.

“ My Lord,—It is now well nigh a twelvemonth since I first understood I was to resign up my charge to my acquaintance and friend; but because I had no fair opportunity offered me, nor knew of it immediately from your Lordship, I did not find myself obliged to take any notice of it: and now I do, it is for no other end than to let your Lordship know how well content I am, for my own part, and how entirely satisfied on my Lord's account, to see him fallen into so good hands, and such as I would have put him into before any in the world besides, had it been in my disposal:—and this I say not on the score of friendship, or that I think it will please your Lordship. Upon due reflection on the whole matter, I find it more convenient for me to look back and consider how I have discharged my trust for these four last years past, than think of adding the weight of four more to come in another capacity, for which I find myself qualified with nothing extraordinary, but a good intention. As I find no reason to retract any thing of the character I have all along given your Lordship of him, so I find as little to repeat it here again. One defect is very sensibly discerned in him, which is an utter ignorance of our own history, which I could very well have remedied, if his close application to school business, which (with other avocations and diversions necessary enough for children) took up all his time, would have given me leave: but of this he will have no great reason to repent, since the time past was well filled, and he has so much of that to come before him, which he may employ in reading that with judgment now, which, if read before, could only have wrought upon his fancy; but in this and all other his defects, it is doubtless a great pleasure to remember he is not yet fifteen. On the other hand, for whatever your Lordship shall like or approve in him, I must needs be so just to his masters, and my friends, as freely to own that as much is due to them as to myself. And thus I have done with him, whom I shall follow, wherever he goes, with the kindest and most tender wishes in the world. It might perhaps have been expected, that in all this interim, I should have taken occasion to ask to be dismissed; and examples, for aught I know, may have countenanced such a custom: but to me it looked so like a piece of solemn, civil dissimulation, that I resolved to have nothing to do with it; and to venture being absurd, if common discretion could not inform me when it was seasonable to take my leave. Your Lordship, I am confident, looked for no such thing, and as for the saving my credit in the world by any such poor blind, there is no need of it, and I utterly disown it. The relation I have had to your Lordship for four years, hath gotten and established me as much credit as I can want, or answer to; and I shall always make it the most considerable part of my character, that in all that time your Lordship hath not shown any apparent dislike of me; and I do not intend to think, you have lately changed your opinion of me, but do believe I am as much in your Lordship's good grace as I ever was; and therefore shall, upon all fair and reasonable occasions, make as constant applications to you, and with as little doubt of success, as if I were actually in your Lordship's service: but this (if I know my own self) will cost your Lordship no great trouble, for my desires and aims have very moderate bounds indeed, and all the reward that I desire for

having never given your Lordship the trouble of one line, either in behalf of myself or friend, since I first knew my Lord Hyde, is, that I might not be mistaken, as though it had proceeded from insensibility, or a stupid negligence of affairs. I shall certainly find my account, one day, in this, that I have been trusted by him whose honour is come to such a pitch, that it can hardly bear an access; yet so well founded that it can hardly suffer diminution; whose great example it is now become matter of much glory to imitate; and to whose generous virtue we owe (in great measure) that noble and religious bravery, which is now so frequent that it almost is become fashionable. So that there is nothing left, to one who does not know your Lordship, to wish you, but a mind to bear this glory equally; and to him who knows you, even that is also taken away. But I am fallen upon a subject that will hurry me beyond all bounds, if I do not stop short:—and pray, my Lord, if I have already taken more liberty than well becomes me, impute it partly to my zeal, and partly to the thought that I am now growing looser from your Lordship; and lastly, that I am pleading in my own advantage. What I have else to say is necessary, and will excuse itself. Though our quarter be not quite ended, yet it is customary to pay the full; for the goods and furniture of our chamber, and every thing of that nature, if examples must guide us, we must leave them all; if not, I am to expect orders. For my Lord's books, I am also to seek to what place I must send them; they are such as were designed by me for his reading when a man, and may deserve to be carefully preserved. Some of his French books I will (with your Lordship's good leave) rob him of, but they shall not be many; and such too, as he will find no great want of, unless he apply to ecclesiastical studies. In other things I shall want no rule: but in these I desire your Lordship's orders; and for this excessive letter your Lordship's pardon in abundance. Suffer me at last to conclude, that your Lordship may have had many a more dexterous, able, and officious, but you never had a more sincere, more obedient, or more humble servant, than

W. FLEETWOOD."

We have no quarrel with Mr. Singer for the expensive form in which he has presented these Volumes. They are not of a kind likely to be found without the pale of established Libraries, and we are glad, therefore, that they are handsomely edited; and also that they include in one Work every thing connected with the younger Hydes. The Trustees of the Clarendon Press would do well to throw the three ponderous folios of *State Papers*, illustrative of the Chancellor's Public life, into a more accessible shape; and thus to connect *en suite* a great mass of authentic documents bearing upon some of the most important and attractive periods of our History.

ART. V.—*A Connection of Sacred and Profane History, from the death of Joshua to the Decline of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah.* By the Rev. Michael Russell, LL.D., Episcopal Minister, Leith. London. Rivingtons. 2 vols. 8vo. 1827. 28s.

THERE are few works in theology of more value to the student than Prideaux's *Connection*; and the popularity which it enjoys is equal to its merit. The object which it embraces, relates to a period of great interest and importance, and one which offered materials of every kind both for the theologian and the historian. The interval between the restoration of the Jews and the birth of Christ, includes almost all that is valuable to be known in Grecian and Eastern history. Authentic documents of all kinds are in abundance, so far as regards the contemporary Heathen nations; and although the original authorities which we possess for the history of the Jewish people are but scanty, yet the events of that period were not numerous or striking; and there is no reason to think that any occurred of which it would be important to be informed, the record of which has been lost. Something, indeed, remains to be desired in that part of their history during this period, which relates to their civil and ecclesiastical polity; but not much even here. It was the age of the fulfilment of prophecy; but as this regarded the nations around them, rather than the events of their own history, this last appears to have been in a kind of abeyance, until the fulness of time arrived, when they were themselves to come again upon the scene; and when our information becomes as minute and particular as it had till then been brief and general.

The success which Prideaux's work obtained, and which, as we have just observed, was owing as much to the happy choice of the subject, as to the learning and good sense which was displayed in his manner of treating it, suggested to Shuckford the idea of writing an account of the "*Connection of Sacred and Profane History*" in the interval between the earliest records of the creation, and that period when the subject was undertaken by Prideaux. But although this would seem to be only a completion of the same original design, yet practically it was a very different kind of undertaking. Here there were no original records of any kind, excepting those which were in everybody's hands. With respect to the Jewish nation, little or nothing was to be said, beyond what we collect from the brief annals of the Sacred Historians. So far from being able to throw light upon the narrative which they have left us, by hints borrowed from the history of the

Heathen nations around them, the point to be aimed at, was rather to ascertain what light could be thrown upon the Heathen nations around them, by hints borrowed from the Scriptures.

Now, undoubtedly, this is a subject well deserving of attention, and in which much was required to be done; but it is not in the same proportion a subject susceptible of popular instruction and interest. Of all the species of learned compilation and research, conjectural history, i. e. the history of what is to be considered as the most probable, is beyond any other dry and uninviting to the common reader; and when the points to be settled or illustrated refer chiefly to the investigation of dates and the comparison of chronological systems and calculations, respecting persons and things of whom nothing whatever is known except the name, the subject becomes dry and uninviting not only to the common reader, but to every class of readers. The writer who chooses such subjects must be satisfied with the praise of a few studious individuals; and except where the labour itself is the reward that was sought, must look to no other recompense than the consciousness of a desire to be useful.

As Shuckford lived nearly twenty years after the publication of his last volume, and yet finished not more than half of his original design, we are led to presume that it must have been the want of encouragement at the time, which was the occasion of his relinquishing so prematurely the labour which he had undertaken. To speak the truth, there were other reasons in his case, besides those which we have mentioned, for his not meeting with any great and sudden success. His work is at least twice as long as his materials warranted; and these are arranged with so little order or method, that the patience of the reader is often severely tried. Neither was his judgment the clearest, or his conclusions always consistent with each other. Nevertheless, in spite of all disadvantages, added to the almost hostile contempt with which his work is treated by Warburton, such is the grave importance of the subject, and the want of some work, (even if it be only as a book of reference,) by which the early Jewish history may be connected with the names of contemporary things and persons mentioned by profane historians, that Shuckford's *Connection* holds its place in most libraries on the same shelf with Prideaux's, and even in its unfinished state has become a standard book in divinity.

That part of his subject which Shuckford either relinquished or was prevented from completing, it is the object of the work before us to fill up; and we think that the public are much indebted to Dr. Russell for having undertaken the task. Although Shuckford professes in his title page to bring down his history to the dissolution of the Syrian empire under Sardanapalus, and the

declension of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah under the reigns of Pekah and Ahaz, yet the period which he accomplished extends only to the conquest of Canaan under Joshua. At this point, then, the work before us, properly speaking, commences. It is the intention of the author to continue it until the time when the work of Prideaux commences; but the volumes before us reach only to the reign of Saul, the remainder of the period being reserved for two concluding volumes. We shall then have eight unusually large and well filled octavo volumes of the history of those nations of the world which flourished before the commencement of any authentic records respecting them, excepting always the brief and broken annals of the Jewish Scripture. Without meaning to pass any censure, we may be allowed to say, that when the whole shall be completed, a very important work will still remain to be executed: we mean a learned and judicious abridgment of the whole, so as to present the subject under some continuous and more easily understood arrangement than the works of Dr. Shuckford and his no less learned and laborious successor exhibit. The work of Dr. Russell is a continuation of the subject of Dr. Shuckford's "Connection;" but it can hardly be called a continuation of the work itself: so much of the ground is common to both writers; so many things are repeated; such different views of particular points are taken; and so little reference is made in the last of these works to the labours and views of his predecessor. In a great measure this was unavoidable, owing to defects in Dr. Shuckford's plan; and not unfrequently owing to views and conclusions in which he was mistaken; but, be the cause what it may, the effect is unfortunate, considering the works as one: the unity of the subject is still preserved, but there is little else that indicates any harmony of design.

The work before us consists of two Books. In Book I. after a long and able preliminary dissertation on the true chronology of the Old Testament, in the times preceding the institution of kingly government in Israel, Dr. Russell proceeds to consider in regular order,—1. The civil and political constitution of the ancient Hebrews. 2. Their religious belief and practices. 3. Their general history, from the death of Joshua to the reign of Saul. Book II. which occupies the whole of the second volume, is employed in examining what is known or conjectured concerning the history of the oriental nations, as connected with that of the Jewish people: comprising the accounts which we possess from heathen authors, of the history of the Babylonians and Assyrians; of the various nations immediately adjacent to the land of Canaan; of the Persian monarchy; and of the origin of the more remark-

able states and kingdoms of ancient Greece; concluding with dissertations on the Argonautic expeditions, the capture of Troy, and the return of the Heraclidæ.

From this account of the contents of the work, the reader will see that the great and highly important object, of the connection of the Jewish people with the history and learning and polity of the Egyptians, is omitted by Dr. Russell in the volumes which he has now presented to the public. We presume that he reserves the subject for the volumes that are to follow; unless, indeed, he considers that part of the subject as having been sufficiently investigated by Shuckford, to whose division of the work it may be said to have more properly belonged. As it is not the part of the early history of the world which that learned writer has laboured with most success, we trust that the department is only reserved in the present work, and not intended to be omitted; as independently of the many questionable statements which Shuckford has hazarded, so much light has been thrown upon the subject of hieroglyphical writing since his time by Warburton, and since Warburton by the recent discoveries of Dr. Young and Mr. Champollion, that in this part of the subject an almost entirely new field of inquiry may be said to have been opened.

Our readers will easily see that it would be impossible to follow our author over the long and wide tract of historical disquisition, which the above outline of his book presents. Indeed there are so few points of any importance, on which we have much reason to differ from his conclusions, that even had we the room we should be without the motive. Dr. Russell is a plain and very straight-forward thinker upon most subjects; he never aims at new results, merely as such; but presents each subject to his reader in that which appears to him to be the simplest point of view, and least to rest upon conjecture. He takes the best guides that he can find, and follows them, for the most part, very steadily, except where he sees reason to distrust their leading. As the work is from the nature of things a compilation of results and opinions, rather than a search after new and unknown truths, we do not know that any more solid praise could be bestowed upon it. Dr. Russell's strong point appears to be chronology. It is to this part of his subject that he returns with most pleasure, and apparently with most confidence in himself. We cannot say that we share with him the opinion which he seems to entertain respecting the importance of some of the dates which he so scrupulously examines; but it is seldom we should be disposed to call in question his conclusions. To settle dates is almost the only business of the historian of the early transac-

tions of mankind; and few writers appear to have been more fitted for the task, either by patience, or industry, or clearness of head, than the exact and laborious author to whom we are indebted for the learned volumes now before us. The reader is perhaps made to tread the same ground more often over than the necessity of the subject in all cases required;—an operation not very welcome to any one who has trodden it before in the writers themselves whom Dr. Russell chiefly consults: but this is a criticism which will comparatively deserve little weight from the general reader, who will find in this work all that can be said upon the subject of ancient chronology, in a form at least as entertaining as in any other work that is to be found.

The great preliminary point which Dr. Russell labours to establish in his first chapter, as that upon which all his subsequent calculations are formed, is the truth of the chronology of the Septuagint. The reader is perhaps aware, that the difference between this and the chronological table of the Hebrew Bible, and of all the modern versions, is not less than 1,400 years. The numbers on the margin of our Bible were inserted by Usher and Lloyd, and adopted by them from the Masorete Jews. The same chronology was adopted at the Council of Trent, and may be said to have been the received chronology in Europe since the period of the Reformation.

That the chronology of the Septuagint is, however, the true, and that of the Masorete Jews a late and a corrupt one, there can be no reasonable doubt. It is now the received opinion of all learned men, by none of whom has the absurdity of the Hebrew chronology been more evidently demonstrated than by our author, in the work before us. The chronology of the Seventy was that of the whole Christian world, until the time of Jerome. It is the same as that which we find in Josephus, in Eusebius, in the first Syriac version. But the Rabbinical chronology was adopted by the early Reformers in opposition to the Church of Rome, who, until that time, had followed the Septuagint; and the Church of Rome herself was induced to adopt it, at the Council of Trent, because finding it necessary to prescribe some authorized version, and having determined that this should be the Vulgate, which was corrected and left in its present state by Jerome, who used the Hebrew copy of the Scriptures, it was finally settled that, from that time, the dates of the Hebrew Scripture should receive the sanction of the Church, and be authorized as the future measure of the ancient dates for the time to come.

According to the Hebrew text, the number of years from the creation to the deluge is 1656, and from the deluge to the birth of Abraham, 292—making in all 1,948 years. Now, according

to the Septuagint, the first of these periods includes 2,262 years; and the last 1072—in all 3,334; making a difference in the calculation of 1386 years.

In order to understand the means by which this great difference was effected, it is necessary to advert to the principle according to which the chronology of the Bible is constructed. The eras of the early history of mankind were measured by the Jews, not by adding together the lives of the several patriarchs, but by taking the sum of what is called their *generations*. For example, the generation of Enos, at the birth of Cainan, is in the Septuagint 190 years, and the residue of his life 715 years, in all 905 years. Now the Hebrew Bible gives the same period for the age of Enos; but it makes his generation only 90 years, adding the hundred subtracted to the remainder of his life, which, according to this calculation, was 815 years. To lengthen or shorten any period, therefore, all that is necessary is to lengthen or shorten the proportion between the generation and the residue of life. By subtracting in this way 100 years from the generation of all of the patriarchs, both before and after the flood, a difference was made in the Hebrew Bibles, amounting to about 1,256 years: the other 130 being occasioned by the insertion of a second Cainan, in the Septuagint, between Arphaxad and Salah.

Now, although it be quite certain that the whole Christian world, and even the Jews themselves, followed the Septuagint in this matter, before Christ, yet, strong as this presumption would be against the modern Hebrew chronology, it would perhaps not be final and demonstrative. The Masoretic Jews might have possessed some proofs of the error of the received system of which we are not aware; at all events, in our ignorance of their reasons for admitting so important an alteration, there might have been some ground of doubt and hesitation of opinion. But though it may not be easy to demonstrate that the Septuagint chronology is right, yet there are strong reasons for believing that the Masoretic text must undoubtedly be wrong; and this point cannot be better stated than in the words of our author.

“It is not to be denied that, from the mutual animosity which was excited between the Jews and Christians, by the recrimination of a long and sometimes a very bitter controversy, the charges of corruption advanced by the latter against the former were occasionally carried too far. But, at the same time, there is no doubt that, in regard to their genealogical tables, the Rabbis of the school of Tiberias made considerable alterations in the original text; and nothing proves so unanswerably that such changes were actually introduced, as the traces which still remain of the method according to which those learned doctors effected their purpose.

“ For example, in order to diminish, to the extent of six hundred years, the period between the creation and the deluge, it was only necessary, as I have already remarked, to subtract a hundred years from the generation of six of the antediluvian patriarchs, and to add the same to the residue of their lives. But, to accomplish this object without falling into the monstrous absurdity of extending the lives of Noah’s father and grandfather beyond the flood, it was found indispensable to allow their generations to remain unaltered; and thus, while Enos is represented as becoming a father at 90, Cainan at 70, and Malaleel at 65, Methuselah does not behold his progeny till he has attained the maturer age of 187, nor Lamech until he has reached his 182d year. The management which had become necessary to adjust the application of the scheme to the peculiar circumstances of every case, betrays the vitiating hand of the Rabbi. The exceptions, in fact, expose the corrupt intention of the general principle on which the innovation proceeded; for, as Enos lived to the age of 905, Cainan to 910, and Malaleel to 895, we can see no cause why they should have married 100 years earlier than Methuselah, whose sum of life was not much greater, and more especially than Lamech, who died at the age of 777. We can discover no intelligible ground for these singularities; but we can perceive, at the first glance, a powerful reason why the generations of Methuselah and Lamech should not be shortened, and the residue of their lives lengthened; and we conclude, that the hundred years were not taken from the former and added to the latter, merely because such a change would have extended the duration of their lives considerably beyond the limits of the antediluvian world.

“ The same remarks, somewhat modified, apply to the case of Jared.— ‘ The Jews,’ says the author of the *Chronological Antiquities*, ‘ had a mind to have left out a century in the ages of all the patriarchs before they begat children, and to have added it to the after-term of their lives; but they found that, if they dropped the centuries of the ages of Jared, Methuselah, and Lamech, before they begat children, as they had done of all the rest, and added them to the remainder of their lives, they must by this reckoning have extended their lives beyond the flood, contrary to the history of Scripture. The flood would have been placed in the year of the world 1356; and Jared, who was born in the year 460, and lived 962 years, would have died in the year 1422, which would have been 66 years after the flood. Methuselah would be born, by the same computation, in the year 587; and, living 969 years, would have died in the year 1556, and 200 years after the flood. Lamech, also, would be born in the year 674, and, living 777 years, would die in the year 1451, which is 95 years after the flood. On this account, the Jews, not daring to shorten the lives of their patriarchs, left the original numbers standing before Methuselah and Lamech, and the Western Jews also before Jared; though they took away the century before Enoch, and added it to the rest of his age after he begat children, because his life was not half so long as any of the rest of the antediluvians, he being translated into heaven when he had lived 365 years.’ The management

here, with respect to Enoch, after having passed over Jared, is certainly a strong proof of rabbinical interference."—vol. i. pp. 86—88.

But the rabbinical calculation is encumbered with other difficulties besides those which have been here stated. Jackson, whose words are quoted at the end of the above extract, has remarked, that if we follow the Hebrew chronology, we must suppose that Abraham died before Shem, who was born a century before the deluge; moreover that he was contemporary with him for the half of that period. These are not the only discrepancies that must be reconciled on the supposition of the Hebrew chronology being received,—but it is not necessary to detail them further; the errors which it involves are now generally admitted by all who have turned their attention to the question; the only point about which any difference of opinion can well exist, is as to the reasons by which the Jews must be supposed to have been influenced, in adopting a computation so greatly at variance with that which was followed, even by their own nation, before the coming of Christ.

Dr. Russell ascribes the change which he thinks must have been introduced into the Hebrew text, to wilful corruption on the part of the Jews; but, we confess, that we do not very clearly enter into the reasons which he states for his opinion, and which he probably adopted from Vossius, who gave the same explanation. But the authority of a writer who contended for the divine inspiration of the Septuagint translation, is entitled to no weight, in this controversy, beyond what the proofs which he brings will confer. That the early Christians believed in the Millennium, there is no doubt; nor can it be doubted that they supposed the reign of the Saints upon earth was then about to take its commencement. This is very fully shown by our author, and indeed will not be questioned; but we do not quite understand by what reasoning this delusion is connected with the error of the Jewish chronology. There was a persuasion, at the period we are now speaking of, that "the end of all things was at hand;" and this was derived among the Christians, partly from those expressions of our Lord, in which he predicted the approaching destruction of Jerusalem, in words which, in a secondary application, appear to have signified the approach of the day of judgment; and partly from a Jewish tradition that the world was to last 6000 years. The Septuagint chronology brought this period nearer than the Jewish, no doubt; but if we look to the Jewish tradition itself, it seems to us that it afforded a temptation, on their part, rather to have lengthened the computation of years from the creation, than to have shortened it.

We are told in the *Talmud*, that according to a tradition pre-

served in the family of Elias, the world was to last 6000 years: of this period, 2000 years were to be before the Law, 2000 years after the Law, and 2000 years of the kingdom of the Messiah. The first-mentioned period terminated, according to them, with the calling of Abraham. Now this tradition agrees better with the Christian hypothesis, according to the Hebrew chronology, than it does according to the Septuagint; for our Saviour came into the world very exactly at the beginning of the third period, if we receive the rabbinical text of the Hebrew; but 1400 too late, if we adopt the Septuagint. So that in the argument between the Jew and the Christian, the Hebrew chronology would afford a proof that Christ was the Messiah; whereas, according to the chronology of the Seventy, no argument, that we see, could have been built by either party, on the evidence which this tradition afforded. Vossius was aware of this, and therefore pretends that the period from which the 6000 years was to be calculated began with the deluge, and not with the creation of the world, forgetting that the sole foundation of the tradition rests altogether on an allusion to the six days of the creation, as has been noticed by Dr. Russell himself. That the Masoretic Jews, or whoever they may have been who substituted the present Hebrew chronology for that which was formerly received, were wrong, we make no doubt. But nothing will be gained to the cause of Christianity by charging them with wilful corruption. It is one of the strong points in Christianity that the guardianship of the sacred volumes of the Old Testament has been committed to the hands of those who are its enemies; but if we suppose these guardians to be unfaithful to their trust, we shall lose more in the argument against infidelity than we can possibly gain, on the other hand, in any controversy with the Jews. It is quite certain that they have not tampered with the sacred text in those places where the temptation to it was greatest; and they ought not, therefore, to be accused of this sacrilege in instances of smaller importance, except upon the evidence of a much more direct proof than Vossius, first, and now our author, can pretend to bring against them.

One of the most decisive reasons for rejecting the Hebrew chronology, is the difficulty of supposing the world to have been in the advanced state of political civilization which it appears to have attained in the days of Abraham, supposing no longer period to have elapsed from the deluge than 292 years. This argument is not overlooked by our author; but there is a passage at page 88, vol. i. which we quote, on account of several doubtful propositions which it appears to us to contain.

“It has been repeatedly remarked, that it is contrary to the ordinary course of nature that men should enter into the relations of matrimony

before they have passed a ninth or tenth part of their lives; and that it is, in fact, not more likely than that children, in our days, should become parents at six or seven years of age. As a proof, too, that the generations of the more ancient patriarchs have been unduly curtailed, we are reminded of the remarkable fact, that the sons of Noah, who were all nearly a hundred years old at the deluge, had not then begun to have children; and it is probable, as Jackson remarks, that they had not been long married; or would not even have been married so soon, had it not been necessary for the propagation of mankind after the flood, that they should take wives with them into the ark; and yet the full extent of their lives, compared with that of their forefathers, was considerably diminished. We find that Shem, one of their number, had a son two years after the flood, when he was at least a hundred years old; but we do not read that the other two brothers, one of whom, Japhet, seems to have been older than Shem, had children at so early a period; and surely it is absurd to suppose that these patriarchs should have been older before they became fathers than several of their ancestors, whose lives were from three to five hundred years longer."

We are far from pretending to any knowledge respecting the families of the patriarchs, beyond what is conveyed to us in the Book of Genesis; but we own it appears to us very improbable to suppose that they had no children except those who are mentioned by name in Scripture. The only account that we can give of the reason why the first race of mankind enjoyed so much longer lives than their posterity, is, that it was a means of accelerating the population of the earth; and accordingly many writers (quoted by Usher, Chron. Sax. c. 5) have made calculations of the probable numbers of mankind at certain given periods after the flood. One of these calculations is cited by our author from Bishop Cumberland, and treated with no small ridicule. The learned bishop takes for his hypothesis, that every couple should be married at twenty, and produce, one with another, twenty children; and he shows that, supposing neither male nor female died in the mean while, there would be in the world at the end of 340 years, upwards of three thousand millions of souls. The comment of our author upon this is as follows:

"When argument terminates in positive absurdity, it is hardly worth while to examine the process of reasoning by which the conclusion was attained. But the most careless reader must be struck with the fact, that Dr. Cumberland has founded his third postulate in utter neglect of the sacred narrative; which, so far from representing the sons of Noah as becoming the fathers of sixty children, states in the most unambiguous language, that their male progeny in the first descent amounted only to sixteen; and gives so little authority for asserting that these young men in their turn married at twenty, that, in the only case where an age is mentioned, the inspired writer takes the pains to inform us that the individual in question, a grandson of the great patriarch, did not

find himself a parent until he was thirty-five. There is assuredly no room for doubt that Shem, Ham, and Japheth, had daughters as well as sons, and probably an equal number of each; but that they had thirty children of either sex, and that these became heads of families at the early age of twenty, and thereby afforded an example which was regularly followed by their descendants during several hundred years, is a position which cannot be maintained without impeaching the fidelity of the sacred volume."—vol. ii. pp. 20, 21.

Now we must confess that we see nothing in the least degree *absurd* in the hypothetical argument of Bishop Cumberland, viewing it, not as the statement of a fact, but merely as a hypothesis. Petavius, whom Dr. Russell will admit to be a high name in these matters, is less timid than our English divine; he supposes* that the posterity of Noah might beget children at seventeen, and that each of Noah's sons might have eight children in the eighth year after the flood, and that every one of these eight might have eight more; and by this means he shows that in only one family, of Japheth, and within 238 years after the flood, there would be an innumerable posterity—two million million, if we remember rightly, or some such number. Neither Petavius nor Bishop Cumberland meant to say that such numbers were actually in existence, but merely intended to show how possible it was to reconcile the Hebrew chronology with the accounts that we have in Scripture. In refutation of these conclusions our author opposes only contrary opinions. He has no authority from Scripture for saying or believing that the patriarchs had no children except those whose names are mentioned; for, as he has himself observed, the names only of male children are noticed: neither has he any warrant for saying, as he does elsewhere, that the Jews calculated the generations of the patriarchs from the birth of their first-born sons. For example, take Genesis, v. 3. "And Adam lived a hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image, and called his name Seth." Here then the generation of Adam is calculated from the birth of Seth; but Cain and Abel (if we may believe the narrative in the margin of our Bibles) had been born *one hundred and twenty-nine years before*: and are we then to assert, that in all that time no other children were born to Adam? Adhering to this principle of reasoning, there were not in the family of Ham fifty persons alive, at the time when his grandson, Nimrod, founded an empire. And as to the principle which Dr. Russell lays down as a maxim, of its being "contrary to the ordinary course of nature that men should enter into the relations of matrimony before they have passed a ninth or a tenth portion of their lives," and that

* De Doctr. Temp. lib. ix.

consequently it is as likely that "children in our days should become parents at six or seven years of age," as that "Enos should become a father at 90, Cainan at 70, or Mahaleel at 65;—on this principle of reasoning we have to observe, that our author must in consistency suppose that the antediluvian patriarchs were not able to speak or walk alone until they were about twenty years of age, and were in a state of boyhood during the first hundred years of their lives. The imagination has some difficulty in accommodating itself to the Scripture account of this matter, according to the simplest view that we take of it; but we do not think that any assistance is afforded, by our author's plan, for completing all the supplemental circumstances. We observe that he speaks of his views as having been repeatedly stated by others, and apparently quotes the authority of the author of "*Chronological Antiquities*"—the learned and laborious Jackson. The only writer whom we can remember as joining in this scheme of Brobdignagian proportions is Harduin, who was driven into it in order to avoid the horns of a dilemma entertaining enough. In the corrected Vulgate translation of Genesis, which, as we before observed, follows the Hebrew, the name of Cainan is omitted between Arphaxad and Salah; but in Luke, who followed the Septuagint, it is inserted. But the Council of Trent having decreed, under the penalty of anathema, that all the books of Scripture are in all points to be received as they are set forth in that particular translation, a difficulty was created which the cautious Father ingeniously avoided, by supposing that Moses omitted the name of Cainan in order to avoid the scandal which the early marriage of him and his father might have given at that day: it was, however, re-instated in the genealogy of Luke, who thought that at his distance of time there was not the same occasion for delicacy; Arphaxad, according to Harduin, having married at eighteen, and his son Salah so early in life as seventeen; for Salah, Cainan's son, was born in the thirty-fifth year of his grandfather, according to the Hebrew copies of Scripture.

We have dwelt upon this topic much longer than it deserved, or than the importance attached to it by our author would warrant. He fully establishes the point which he endeavours to demonstrate in this part of the Scripture Chronology, and can easily spare the particular argument we have here been examining. The preliminary dissertation, to which our remarks heretofore have been chiefly directed, is a very able and valuable performance; and places before the reader, at one view, all that is necessary to be known in the study of the early Jewish Chronology.

With regard to the Chronological disquisitions respecting the nations of profane history, and which occupy the largest portion

of the second volume, they do not afford such clear and certain results; and are therefore less valuable to the mere inquirer after truth. As we are entirely ignorant of all the events and transactions of every kind relating to this early period of history, and cannot even pretend to know any more than merely the names of the kings who succeeded each other in Assyria and Egypt, according to the true order of their respective dates, we have always looked upon the study of this part of ancient history, as being something like attempts at the discovery of a North-west passage, or of a great Polar Continent in the Southern hemisphere. If the things exist, we should be glad to know them: but as to any use to which our knowledge could be turned, that point is not so clear. Enough has been written on the subject to make it evident that there is nothing in the catalogues of Ctesias, or Manetho, to make us doubt the truth of Scripture history; and beyond this point there is no important end to be answered by speculating on a subject where there are so few materials for reasoning, and those few clouded with so much darkness and uncertainty.

Respecting this last point, we mean the uncertainty of all the records we possess of heathen writers relating to the early history of mankind, it is probable our author will not agree with us. He seems to see his way much more clearly through this labyrinth of names and years than we are able to do, who followed him. This, we do not doubt, was partly the fault of our own impatience; but the truth is, when one knows that the premises are necessarily and demonstrably full of doubt and conjecture, it requires a strongly acquired taste for the subject not to jump a little faster than the pace of our author will allow, who thinks, that by patient examination, truth may be separated from fable, and fixed conclusions be obtained: more especially when these conclusions themselves are as dry, and almost as inapplicable to any practical use, as the fossil bones which were left by the flood. They show that there were kings, and men, and states, and cities, in the early periods of the world, just as we know from geology that there were animals before the flood; it gratifies the imagination to behold the ocular proofs of this, but the feeling is soon satisfied. But our author must speak for himself:

“On the authority of history, both sacred and profane, we are warranted to assert that, even prior to the Exode, the Assyrian empire had risen to considerable power; that the successors of Ninus had already extended their arms towards the east and south as far as the Persian gulf, and the deserts which divide Media from the banks of the Indus; and, moreover, that some of the more warlike of these princes had occasionally threatened the tranquillity of Egypt and the independence of Palestine. But the succinct and sometimes contradictory narratives of

the ancient writers do not enable us to define with accuracy the limits of that government, or to ascertain the names and succession of the monarchs by whom it was exercised. No question in the history of Asia has been less satisfactorily determined than that which respects the time when the Assyrians first laid the foundations of a regular policy, and the length of the period during which their ascendancy as a state continued to subsist. Some authors have even expressed great doubts whether the ancient empire of Assyria ever had an existence; and have accordingly viewed the several dynasties which are recorded by Ctesias and Diodorus Siculus, as the fictions of oriental vanity, alike inconsistent with probability and with the more authentic annals of a later age. It may therefore be worth while to inquire, upon general grounds, into the authority of those lists of Babylonian and Assyrian kings which have been transmitted to our times in the works of historians and chronographers; and which, in the discussions which have been pursued by the learned in regard to this intricate subject, are usually associated with the names of Ctesias, Abydenus, Eusebius, Africanus, and Syncellus."—vol. ii. pp. 3, 4.

Our author then goes on to vindicate those writers, and more especially Ctesias, from the aspersions which have been thrown on their truth and fidelity; and nothing can be more just and sensible than the whole of his remarks. But they only show that Ctesias and Manetho, and other annalists of the same character, did not forge the names which they have left us, or falsify the records from which they were extracted. This may readily be granted; we have no doubt it is perfectly true; and no one has shown better than our author himself, how many apparent difficulties and contradictions there are, which a little explanation will often remove. But still, it is impossible to look into the lists of names which Ctesias has left us, or those still more authentic catalogues which we have of Manetho, without feeling that no dependence whatever can be placed, for any particular facts, on the records themselves, from which these writers drew their materials. One opinion may be more probable than another; but no conclusion can be drawn from them, on which it would be allowable or safe to build any consequential reasoning.

But independently of the uncertainty arising from the difficulties inherent in our materials themselves, the uncertain form of the years, on which the heathen calculations were made, and the absence of any fixed epochs, throw additional doubt upon whatever results we may deduce. A year is nothing but a system of days; and when we know that the ancient year was sometimes lunar, and sometimes solar; sometimes of 360 days, and sometimes of 365; sometimes of four months, sometimes of longer periods even than that by which we calculate, how is it possible to place any dependence upon any chronological tables that may be formed? Macrobius tells us (*Satur. lib. i.*) *that among the Egyptians alone*

there was always a certain fixed form of the year; and yet Plutarch, in his life of Numa, says that the Egyptians had at first a year consisting only of one month, afterwards of four; and Varro, in Lactantius, giving an account of some men among the Egyptians who lived a thousand years, observes, that they calculated by the lunar, and not the solar year; and for this reason, says Plutarch, in Numa, the Egyptians reckon in their accounts an infinite number of years.

If we turn from the Egyptian to the Chaldean Chronology, there we encounter the same kind of confusion. The times of their first kings are reckoned not by years, but by Σάροι, Νεῖροι, and Σῶσαι; the first consisting of 3600 years, the second of 600, and the last of 60 years. Now if we compute the year to consist of four months, or one month, or one day, just as the case may happen to demand, we are often able to reduce the Egyptian and Chaldean calculations to some agreement with the Bible: but when we have shown that no tables, consisting of such variable elements, are of a character to make us doubt the Chronology of Scripture, we seem to have settled the only problem which it is important to determine.

We observed just now, that another difficulty in the way of fixing the early Heathen Chronology, proceeds from the want of any determinate epocha, or παραλήγματα, from which to reckon. With respect to the Chaldeans and Egyptians, we know of no era in their Chronology that is not comparatively modern; and the Grecians do not deny that their computation of time is not to be depended upon until the commencement of their Olympiads. Sir Isaac Newton attempted to supply this desideratum by astronomical calculations; but whatever praises we may bestow upon the genius which prompted the attempt, we believe it is pretty generally understood, that the premises of his reasoning are not such as to warrant any such certain conclusions as he considered himself to have established. His argument was briefly this:

“Chiron,” said he, “formed the calculations for the use of the Argonauts, and placed the solstitial and equinoctial points in the fifteenth degrees, or middle of the constellations of Cancer, Chilæ, Capricorn, and Aries. Meton, in the year of Nabonassar 316, observed the summer solstice in the eighth degree of Cancer, and therefore the solstice had then gone back seven degrees. It goes back one degree in about 72 years, and seven degrees in about 504 years; count these years back from the year of Nabonassar 316, and they will place the Argonautic expedition 936 years before Christ:”

that is, about 300 years later than by the Greeks themselves. This is a brief account of the principle on which Newton founded his

Chronology, as given by himself in his "Short Chronicle," p. 25. If the reader wishes to see a more full and detailed account of his system, he will find a long and able examination of it in the preface to the last volume of Shuckford. The difficulty which it presents is very shortly stated. Nothing was more easy than for so great an astronomer as Sir Isaac Newton, to calculate where the solstice ought to be placed in the year of our Lord 1689, and to know how many years have passed since they were in the fifteenth degrees of the constellations. But even supposing that we were certain of the fact that Chiron was not a fabulous person, and did really fix the solstice, yet what certainty have we that he rightly fixed them? Now there is much stronger evidence for doubting the fact of Chiron's having fixed the equinoctial points at all, as above stated, than there is in favour of it, which, in truth, is almost none whatever: but it is quite certain that there was no nation in the world whose knowledge of astronomy was sufficient, at the period we are now speaking of, for determining, with any reasonable accuracy, so nice and difficult a problem as that which we are considering.

Our object in these remarks has not been to criticise any of our author's conclusions, from which it is seldom that we should be tempted to differ, but merely to show that all that we know, with any certainty, of early Chronology, must be drawn from the Bible, and the Bible alone. With respect to Heathen Chronology, where it appears to contradict the Bible, it is not entitled to the smallest attention; and it is only in those parts where light is thrown upon it by the Bible, that we are able to reason about it at all. As to any independent evidence of its own, it has none; and, but for the knowledge of profane history, which we draw from the sacred histories, all that is related by heathen historians, respecting the early empires of the world, would probably have been rejected as mere fable. We have extended our remarks to so great a length upon this interminable subject of Heathen Chronology, that we fear our readers will suppose that the volumes before us relate to nothing else. Chronology, Scaliger tells us, is *the life and soul of History*; he might have added, *and the body too*, in that part of history which concerns the heathen nations of the world, at the period Dr. Russell treats of. But it would be doing a great injustice to the value and variety of his labours to infer that they are confined merely to an examination of dates. He has mixed up in his work a large proportion of other topics, many of them possessing much interest in themselves, and always that interest which may be imparted even to very dry subjects, when they are handled with as much good sense as he uniformly displays.

The period of history, to which that part of Dr. Russell's work which is now before us refers, includes a period of something more than 500 years; a pretty long tract of time considered in itself. But not only are the records which we possess of this period very scanty and imperfect, being confined to the brief document of the Book of Judges, but it happens also, that there is no considerable period of the Jewish history so dry, and barren of subjects for theological inquiry and investigation. The promulgation of the law, and the consideration of the various topics connected with that important fact, belong to the labours of Dr. Russell's predecessor. The foundation of the temple, and the establishment of the Jews, as a single nation in a politicized state, come under that division of his work which he has reserved for future consideration. The scheme of prophecy is, in this part of Jewish history, in a state of suspension: and our knowledge of the domestic governments of the several tribes, or of the nature of that federal constitution under which they appear to have acted on occasions when it was necessary to appoint a head, is so extremely limited, that it is hardly safe to depend upon it as the ground of any general speculations. Dr. Russell has classed all the facts together which bear upon the same points, and has presented the reader with a sort of historical paraphrase, in which whatever is important is put forward into a strong light, and a certain order given to the transactions that occur, according as they relate to the civil, or religious, or political circumstances of the nation; this is done clearly, and with ability; but not in a way that offers much occasion for particular comments. We do not think that his materials afforded any legitimate opportunity for the display of learning, or of originality, and he has too much sense to hunt for such opportunities at the risk of running into pedantry or paradox.

It was impossible, however, to examine attentively even the slight notices of the surrounding nations and tribes which are presented to us in the Book of Judges, without being occasionally led into disquisitions upon more general topics. The subject of idolatry alone is fruitful in questions of this kind; and no disposition is shown to avoid them in the work before us, however little hope there may be of throwing any light upon this part of the early history of mankind, beyond what is to be collected from the writings of preceding authors. One of the topics which Dr. Russell examines at some length, regards the belief that was entertained by the Jews concerning an "evil principle." It appears to have been suggested to him by the opinions delivered by Warburton respecting the Book of Job. The Bishop, as the reader probably knows, has ascribed to this inspired composition, a much more

recent date than had been commonly supposed. As Warburton was ignorant of Hebrew, his opinion was founded not on direct argument drawn from the language and style, but from the manner in which Satan is mentioned, which he said gave proofs of a way of thinking among the Jews, which was borrowed by them from the Babylonians, and consequently was evidence of a date not more ancient than the Captivity.

On this, our author remarks, and shows, at considerable length, that the opinion held by the Magians, to which Warburton refers, was entirely different from that which is expressed in the Book of Job, and which last is shown to be in perfect accordance with the opinion held by the Jews long preceding the Captivity. According to the Magian philosophy, the world was governed by two distinct and independent principles, whereas, in the Book of Job, Satan is described not as a being of co-ordinate power and authority with the Almighty, but merely as the messenger of his wrath, and as much the instrument of his will, as any of the more beneficent agents whom, at times, he is represented as employing. The doctrine held by the Jews, on this subject, is thus stated by Dr. Russell; and if the reader will compare the extract from 1 Kings, xxii. with that passage in Job (ch. i. 6. 12) where the Adversary is introduced as presenting himself before the Lord, he will probably agree with us, in setting down the criticism of Warburton as one among the many examples which his work affords, of rash precipitate judgment.

“ The simple theology which they held prior to the Babylonish captivity, taught them that all events, whether prosperous or adverse, proceeded from the direct counsel and appointment of Jehovah; that good and evil sprang from the same source; that life and death, heat and cold, light and darkness, pain and enjoyment, were measured out by the same hand, through the instrumentality of different agents. Their creed admitted the important tenet, that, among the various orders of intellectual beings superior to man, there were some who delighted in obedience and happiness; while others, actuated by pride and malignity, found their most acceptable employment in directing the arrows of affliction, and in covering with darkness and fear the hearts of the human race. But the Hebrew divines never allowed themselves to doubt that these spirits, as well as the more beneficent ministers of his will, were under the constant and immediate control of the omnipotent God; and that they exceeded not, in the commissions with which they were intrusted, the bounds of his authority, nor extended their destructive services beyond the precise object which they were meant to realize. These evil angels were even understood to occupy a place in the presence of the Eternal, as did the other intelligencies who were employed only in messages of goodness; and both were indiscriminately called the sons of God, and enrolled in the host of heaven.

"The doctrine now stated receives full and various illustration from several passages of Scripture. When Ahab, for example, was about to adopt the foolish measures which were made to result in the punishment of his sins, the sacred historian unfolds the counsels of the Almighty in the following terms :—'And Micaiah said, Hear thou therefore the word of the Lord : I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him on the right hand and on the left. And the Lord said, Who will persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth Gilead ? And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner. And there came forth a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, I will persuade him. And the Lord said unto him, Where-with ? And he said, I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said, Thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also : Go forth, and do so.' (1 Kings, xxii. 19—22.)

"It is not our business, at present, to inquire into the matter and authority of Micaiah's vision ; but we may be certain that the theological views which it embraces were in perfect agreement with the belief of the two kings whom he addressed, as well as with that of his countrymen at large. The good and evil spirits are represented by him as standing around the throne of God, the one class on the right hand and the other on the left, and as equally ready to execute his commands : and whatever allowance we may be disposed to make for oriental figure, and the adaptation of divine things to the conception of an illiterate people, we must at least admit, that the Persian doctrine of the Two PRINCIPLES was not yet known to the inhabitants of Palestine."—vol. i. pp. 255—256.

Another opinion of Warburton appears to have been the occasion of suggesting to our author a long and learned, and very interesting inquiry into the state of opinion among the Jews, at the several periods of their history subsequent to Moses, concerning the immortality of the soul and a future state of rewards and punishments. Warburton had maintained that Moses himself was informed of this last doctrine, but kept it back designedly from the Jews. We forget, at the present moment, the reason assigned by the Bishop for this reserve, or rather we should say, the reason for supposing that any light had been vouchsafed to the Jewish Lawgiver, by God, which he was not allowed to communicate to the rest of his nation. In itself the supposition is not very probable, and, whether true or false, was not capable of proof. The refutation of it, however, leads Dr. Russell into an investigation, which we recommend to the reader, as containing the examination of many facts and opinions on this subject, highly deserving of inquiry.

Assuming that the Egyptians believed in the immortality of the soul, at the early period of the Jewish captivity among them, (a point which seems to be admitted by all writers,) it would be almost a paradox to suppose that they had not taught it to the

Israelites, among whom it is evident that the Egyptian learning was in much authority and esteem. As there is nothing whatever in the writings of Moses, or in the character of his laws, to destroy or contradict this doctrine, the natural conclusion is, that the Jews, after the Exode, retained the same belief respecting it, which they brought with them out of Egypt. Omitting this antecedent probability, we do not think that our author's proofs of the fact, in reference to the times of which he is treating, would carry sufficient strength to support the conclusions which he draws; but, connected with presumptive evidence in its favour, he appears to us to have succeeded in establishing his argument.

With respect to his next position, of the belief of the Jews in a metempsychosis, we doubt whether he has not stated his conclusion somewhat too broadly. The passages and texts which he produces from the Apocrypha and from the New Testament, undoubtedly bear the construction which he puts upon them, and are sufficient to show that such an opinion must have been very extensively entertained; but, at least, an equal number of passages and texts might be brought forward, bearing an opposite conclusion. These Dr. Russell does not notice; and it is hardly worth while supplying his omission, as they must be familiarly known to those who have turned their attention to the point. We have no doubt that, in point of fact, there was no uniform or generally received doctrine upon the subject; in the absence of all knowledge, whether natural or revealed, opinion would be mere conjecture, which would vary as opinion always does, whenever there is no fixed point to reason from, and the only question is, which imagination is most probable. It is the belief of Warburton, indeed, that the doctrine of 'future rewards and punishments' though kept back by Moses from the Jews of his time, was afterwards revealed to them by the Prophets. And, undoubtedly, there are many passages in the prophetic books, in which this truth is implied. But we are not to consider every thing which the Prophets spoke, as having the distinct authority of a formal revelation.

That the Jews did not so understand their writings is very evident, or there would have been no difference of opinion among them on an article so important. But when we find that one party among them denied the promise of a resurrection, and another maintained it, and a third understood by it the doctrine of the metempsychosis, it is plain that their respective opinions were built rather upon inferences from Scripture, than from any formal and authoritative declarations of God. The celebrated answer of our Saviour to the Sadducees (Matt. xxii.) "Ye do

err not knowing the Scriptures," &c. is a presumption of this, and is so urged by Grotius in one of his Letters to Vossius (Ep. 13). Had there been any text in the law of Moses, or any in the Prophets bearing directly the authority of express revelation, declaring the doctrine of the soul's proper immortality, our Lord would rather have adduced it, than have silenced the Sadducees by the indirect argument which is given by the Evangelist. It may, indeed, be said, that our Saviour did not quote the Prophets, because their authority was denied by the Sadducees. Perhaps this answer is sufficient to this particular argument; but without dwelling too much on any single text, surely it is hardly probable that in the case of so momentous a doctrine as that which we are now speaking of, God would have dropped the revelation of it, merely casually and in the parenthesis only of a prophecy relating to the temporal affairs of the Jews.

Warburton, indeed, affirms, that the promise of a future life was formally revealed to the Jews in a distinct covenant, of which he thinks he can find the evidences in the prophetic writings. But every one who reads that part of his work will immediately observe that he is merely propping up his favourite hypothesis. The miraculous providence under which the followers of Moses and their immediate descendants lived, was evidently withdrawn (as he thought) during the later period of their history; and, therefore, his hypothesis made it necessary that its place should be supplied by the belief of future rewards and punishments in another life. Nor was the mere belief of this doctrine sufficient; his argument required that the support of it should be divine revelation; and, therefore, a second covenant, distinct from the Mosaic, is assumed, the proof of which he finds in a passage of Ezekiel, which evidently had never been so understood by the Jews themselves, for whose use this supposed covenant was vouchsafed.

Now, whether the knowledge of a future state had been communicated to the Jews or not, is a matter which will not at all affect the truth of Christianity. That it was not communicated to them by Moses is quite certain; and unless some much more weighty reason can be given for believing that it was a subject afterwards of separate revelation, than the mere convenience of Warburton's hypothesis, we should feel strongly inclined to think, that it was a point respecting which the Jews may have entertained more defined opinions in the days of the Prophets, than at their first settlement in the land of Canaan, but without any, or with very little, additional knowledge.

It is pretty well understood now, that this admission may be made without any detriment to the proof of Christianity. At

the time when Warburton lived, infidel writers had not fallen into the contempt with which they are now, for the most part, covered; and their attacks upon the truth of Revelation excited much greater anxiety and alarm than at present; and the defence was in proportion less fearless and judicious. Accordingly when Bolinbroke and Voltaire, and other deistical writers charged the Mosaic Dispensation as being of mere human contrivance; and in proof of its having no pretensions to divine revelation, alleged the absence of this great doctrine, of which we are now speaking, the adversaries on the side of Christianity, instead of denying the conclusion, which they might have done very safely, somewhat hastily endeavoured to refute the premises, than which nothing was more difficult or unnecessary. Supposing the truth of the Christian scheme of our redemption, it is plain, "that life and immortality" could not be brought to light, except by the Gospel. The declaration of this truth, by divine authority under the Old Testament, would be a difficulty that would require to be explained, according to the hypothesis of the New Testament; its not having been so declared, is an objection which carries no weight, except on the supposition of the Jewish Religion having been a complete and independent dispensation. On the supposition of its having been merely a preparatory scheme, intended to be done away, and receiving its true completion in the establishment of another and more perfect revelation, it is quite evident, that the absence of the promise of a future state, is merely a proof of this last proposition, but is no argument whatever to show that Moses was not sent from God.

Agreeably to what we are here saying, we may observe, that nothing can be greater than the anxiety of the Jewish writers to have it believed, that the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead and of a future state is part of their law. Maimonides calls it the *fundamentum excellentium fundamentorum*; and another goes still farther, and says, that even if a person should firmly believe in these doctrines, and yet deny that they have been revealed in the law, he must be considered as denying both. *Quod si quis fide firmâ crediderit resurrectionem mortuorum, non autem credidit esse illam ex lege, ecce ille reputatur ac si hæc omnia negaret.*—(R. Jehud. Zabara. apud Dassov.) For the Jews are perfectly aware, that except they can make it be believed that this doctrine is contained in their law, it will be quite impossible for them to give any explanation of its present meaning or design; and either they must *deny the whole*, or else suppose that it was intended by God for that which unquestionably it accomplished, and which Christians affirm to have been its end, namely, the introduction of the Gospel.

From what has been said, it is, we think, plain, that the absence of the doctrine of future rewards and punishments, from the law of Moses, is a good argument for Christians against Jews; but is no argument whatever for infidels against Christians; and therefore nothing could be less called for, than the violent opposition which was raised by Dr. Stebbing and others, against the "Divine Legation" of Warburton, on the subject of his opinions respecting this point. But when not content with denying that this doctrine was to be found in the books of Moses, and justifying the omission against the ignorance and misrepresentations of infidels, he turned short round upon these last and endeavoured to knock them down with their own argument, contending that the silence of Moses on this important head, was by itself a demonstration of his "Divine Legation," this was a proposition, the only recommendation of which was its boldness, especially as he managed the argument. Supposing Moses to have been an impostor, there can be no doubt that it is much more likely he would have endeavoured to enforce his laws by the promise of rewards and punishments in the next life, than of blessings or curses in this world. Because the former could not be disproved, at all events; whereas, a short time was likely to bring the latter to a test. But Warburton disdained such a common-place kind of reasoning as this. He boldly affirmed that since the world began no legislator ever pretended that he could give due authority to his laws, without the aid of religion and of a belief in a future state: nay, he even denied, on abstract principles, that such a fact was possible. Since Moses, therefore, had established a system of laws, in which this last sanction was wanting, it follows demonstrably, says he, and without any other proof, that its place must have been supplied, as Moses promised, by a miraculous providence distributing rewards and punishments in this life. However ready we may be to subscribe to this last fact, yet with respect to the particular reasoning by which Warburton declares that it is to be demonstrated, we believe that the only doubt that has ever prevailed, is, whether he himself believed the proof which he would allow no one else ever to question. Had the Jews, notwithstanding their ignorance of another life, been a nation remarkable for their peaceable demeanour and submissive obedience to the Mosaic laws, there would, perhaps, have seemed to be some evidence from facts in confirmation of his explanation of their superior virtue as a people; but the truth is, that the hypothesis of his argument is refuted by the evidence of the very people on whose history it is founded. The Jews were as remarkable for their frequent rebellions and refractory disobedience to the laws, as any people with whom we are ac-

quainted: so that an adversary of Warburton might fairly say, that if Moses trusted to the effects of a miraculous providence, as a substitute for the ordinary sanctions of religion, the effect showed that he was mistaken; and either that miraculous providence was never exerted, or if it was, it proved to be of no sufficient authority, in the place of those more effectual obligations of morality which a belief in future rewards and punishments is able to create.

We are disposed to think, however, that Warburton's celebrated hypothesis, labours under other difficulties besides those which we have here stated. In the recapitulation which he makes of his argument at the end of the sixth book of the *Divine Legation*, he says that the origin of his work arose from his having observed two things, which struck him as extraordinary, when reading the Old Testament: 1. The omission of the doctrine of future rewards and punishments; and 2. an extraordinary providence; and putting these two things together, he tells us that they afford the demonstration of a miraculous dispensation. In what way this conclusion follows, we have just seen; but even if we pass over all minor objections, there is another consideration which would lead us to distrust his reasoning. We are greatly mistaken, if he does not entirely misconceive the nature of that miraculous providence, under which the Jews undoubtedly were placed. His reasoning supposes that the extraordinary providence under which the Israelites were placed regarded them not as a nation, but in their individual capacity. That the promises of the Jewish law were merely temporal is quite certain; but that they were to be dispensed to each individual among the people, in exact proportion to his good or ill deserts in life is a proposition which is so very far from certain, that we believe it to be totally without foundation: at least we do not even know what the proof is, by which those who entertain this opinion are accustomed to prove the assertion. As far as the history of the Jewish people may be depended upon, it does not appear to us to warrant any conclusion of the kind. We see good men suffering adversity, and bad men prospering in the world, pretty much after the same proportion and in the same manner as among ourselves, where the general rule is in favour of virtue and piety, though subject to innumerable exceptions. And if we look to the laws of Moses themselves, there are in them the same civil penalties and restraints of violence and wrong, as in all other legal codes. If from the history of the Jews and the enactments of their laws we turn to the prophetic promises and denunciations which their Scriptures contain, it is not said that good men shall be princes and rulers in the land, and bad men their servants and

menial dependants: it is not said that the adulterer shall be afflicted with pains and fevers, but that he shall be put to death. Promises, indeed, there are, and threats, but they are such as regard the nation in general indiscriminately; rain and fruitful seasons, triumph over their enemies and deliverance from bondage, war, and the sword, and pestilence, and famine, and captivity: these are the subjects concerning which the Lord is constantly warning his people by the mouth of his prophets. If individuals are to be chastised by name, it is by special appointment, often long before proclaimed, and not as a matter of course, in consequence of the general principles of the divine government as it regarded the Jewish nation in particular. In all national judgments the innocent suffer with the guilty; and the sins of the fathers are necessarily visited upon the children: but to suppose, as Warburton does, that God had made this the standing rule of his government, in the case of *individuals* among the Jews, and that men were not only to suffer the consequences of the sins of their fathers, (as we witness every day in the world,) but to be directly punished for the guilt of such sins, the same as if they had been committed by themselves, implies a very harsh interpretation of God's dealings with the Jews; and one, indeed, which would almost serve to palliate their frequent desire of seeking to be governed by other gods.

By declaring such to be the principle of his government, it seems to us, that God plainly discloses the true nature of those temporal punishments and rewards by which he restrained the Jewish people: that they regarded the nation in its collective and not in its individual capacity. In the former sense, the truth of that miraculous providence under which the Jewish people were placed, was exemplarily manifested in every part of their history, from their going down into Egypt, until the very times in which we now live; but in the latter sense, we are not aware that there is any truth whatever in the fact, considered as a general proposition, further than as is asserted in the New Testament, with respect to those who live under the Gospel. It is, indeed, a supposition absolutely necessary to the hypothesis of Warburton; because if the Jews, personally, were restrained solely by the arm of civil penalties and enactments, without any promise of miraculous reward in this life for virtue and obedience, or any threat of miraculous punishment for transgressions of the law—in that case the extraordinary providence which watched over the NATION, cannot be supposed to have afforded any substitute for the Christian doctrine of rewards and punishments, as regards the conduct of INDIVIDUALS.

We have been led into this disquisition on the Divine Lega-

tion by the frequent reference to that celebrated work in the volumes before us; but we have to apologize both to Dr. Russell and the reader for the length of our remarks. So replete is that extraordinary performance with truth and paradox, with reasoning the most acute and sophisms the most wilful, with learning the most various and profound, combined with criticisms and positions which would often do discredit even to a school-boy, that it is difficult to get into the examination of any one part of the work, without being led away from subject to subject, and beyond the limits which discretion would prescribe.

We now close the volumes which have given rise to these and to our preceding remarks, with the highest respect for the talents and learning and industry of the author. The great fault which we have to find with his work is want of arrangement. Not only does he recur too often to subjects and facts which are treated at length both in Shuckford and Prideaux, which as a continuer of these works, he ought to have avoided as much as possible, but he sometimes repeats himself; and in this way has not only made his work longer, but also somewhat less attractive than it might have been. The part of his subject which it remains for him to treat, is much more difficult as well as much more important than that which belongs, properly, to the present volumes. But there are also very many more materials to assist him; and we look forward to the completion of his labours with the expectation of much and useful instruction.

ART. VI.—*The Celtic Druids.* By Godfrey Higgins, Esq. F.S.A. 4to. pp. xcvi. and 316. London. Hunter. 1827.

THE Celtic antiquities of the British Isles have been illustrated by the researches of Borlase, Vallancey, Davies, Hibbert, Stukeley, Sir R. Hoare, and others; but they have mostly limited their inquiries to one branch of the subject, and have laboured the more usefully on that very account. Mr. Higgins's merit is, that he has made a hotchpotch out of them all, and thrown into it more strange and ill-assorted ingredients than ever entered the mystic cauldron of the Druids. The condiment with which he has seasoned it is hatred of priests, which is the more amusing, because he is placed in a most ludicrous predicament by his admiration of the Druids as Celts, and his abhorrence of them as priests. On the one hand his theory requires him to acknowledge, that they were skilful, learned and polite; great astronomers, able legislators, honest patriots; that they had a knowledge of gunpowder, telescopes and the compass; that their code of morals was excellent, and their administration of justice pure, the trial by jury

being their invention; in short, that they were venerated by all the world. But on the other hand, they were unfortunately priests; and when that thought rises to his mind it is gall and wormwood to him; he is ready to exclaim with Timon, "Rid me these villains from your companies; hang them, or stab them; drown them in a draught; confound them by some course." Perhaps being muzzled by his theory, and so restrained from falling on the Druids, he barks the more at the rest of the tribe; certain it is, that he shows his teeth whenever he meets them. If a Rabbi boasts too much of his law, it is "most sacerdotal and matchless effrontery;"* if the Grecian mythology is fabulous, it is all owing to the priests, who, like the whole fraternity, "cheat the populace with juggling tricks, and always endeavour to keep them in ignorance."† But the most extraordinary charge of this Misolierist is, that priests hardly ever give themselves time to think.‡ What would his book have been if there had not been such thinking priests as Davies, Maurice, Faber, Borlase, Roberts, Dutens, Prideaux, Shuckford and Ledwich? However, we have no concern with his peculiar antipathies: Evelyn relates that Lord Stafford could not sit at a table where the dessert was garnished with roses; but the roses were none the worse for Lord Stafford's antipathy; nor will the priests be much disturbed by the malevolence of Mr. Higgins.

Setting aside, therefore, this peculiarity, we are of opinion that he has done his countrymen considerable service, by attracting their attention to the aboriginal antiquities of these Islands. Who can resist the contagion of Celtic enthusiasm, when he appeals to the evidence of so many lithographic prints, which occupy nearly half the volume? they are well executed, and certainly most appropriate to the representation of such extraordinary *Αἰῶνες*.

Mr. Higgins boasts of the rapidity with which he has executed his task. It would have been better if he had taken more time: he might have avoided numerous mistakes, a few of which our duty compels us to point out.

1. He condemns "the carelessness with which the Greeks have rendered the words and letters of one language into another,"§ especially the change of *a* into *o*. Now if he has ever heard the languages of which he writes pronounced, he must know the extreme difficulty, in general, of making out any distinct sound exactly corresponding to our vowels, even with the greatest care; and his residence in Yorkshire might have taught him, that in the dialects of our own language, *a* and *o* pass into one another; and though the north-countryman preserves the sound of *a* in such words as hall and fall, yet the common pro-

* P. 132.

† P. 108.

‡ P. 140.

§ P. 6.

nunciation almost confounds it with *o*. On the other hand, he frequently turns the *o* into *a*, as in *mair*, *sair*, &c. Thus, too, the *aleph* of the Hebrews is *oleph* in Syriac, and both sounds are represented under the same character by the Masoretic points.

2. He suggests a mode of learning the art of calculation,* which *might* have been resorted to by the first race of men, and thence concludes not only that it *must* have been employed, but that it actually *was*. If this is a specimen of the reasoning by which he boasts of having proved that the Sabbath was not instituted till the time of Moses, his friends, the priests, have no occasion to argue that matter with him. In the first place, it is not true, as he asserts, that the septenary cycle may be discovered in every nation that has learned the art of arithmetic. "The week of seven days," says Humboldt, "was unknown in America, as well as in part of *Central Asia*;" (this, it will be seen by-and-by, is touching him in a tender part;) "the least division of time amongst the Muyscas was three days."† But in the next place, his theory is truly, as he calls it himself, "an aerial castle" without a foundation; for it is not true that the moon performs her revolution in 28 days; and, therefore the septenary cycle could not have been obtained by quartering that period; she takes more than 29 days. Is it possible that the Misohierist could have been ignorant of this? However, he could not be ignorant that there are 365 days in the year; and yet he goes on to say, that if these first men collected calculi, *i. e.* pebbles, and deposited one for every day, they would find there were 360 days in a period of the sun's revolution. How would they find that? Accurate observation would teach them otherwise; and the inaccurate observation which might certainly be expected from men who counted with pebbles, might as well bring them to 359, or 361, or 364, which, indeed, upon the hypothesis of their having discovered months of 28 days *long before*, is the number on which they would naturally fix, in order that the lunar and solar periods might coincide. But in the next page he forgets all about the first discovery of the septenary cycle, and is so busy with his division of the circle and the solar year, that he loses sight entirely of the many hundred years, which he had before supposed to elapse between that discovery and the invention of geometry; for, says he "about the time this was going on, (the division of the circle into 360 degrees,) they would *find* that the moon made 13 lunations in a *year* (that is 360 days), of 28 days each, instead of 12 only of 30."‡ They would be very clever indeed, if they could find 13 times 28 in 360. To make some amends for demolishing this baseless fabric of a theory, we beg leave to suggest to Mr. Higgins, (and

* P. 8.

† Researches, vol. ii. p. 110.

‡ P. 10.

we doubt not that he will thank us for the hint,) that *three* has been a mystical number ever since the creation; that 360 is a multiple of 3; that 9 is the square of 3; and that 90 is the simplest division of the circle.

3. His argument about the Druids' letters is singularly clumsy and inconclusive; he wants to prove that the Druids used the Greek letters brought by Cadmus to Greece before their increase—the Pelasgic letters;* and Cæsar is his authority: Cæsar says, they used Greek letters. What Greek did Cæsar mean? Was he an antiquary—a book-worm—an examiner of Alphabets—an adorer of the Celts—a Higgins? No; he was conversant only in polite literature, and the best-bred gentleman, as well as the greatest general, of his age. What Greek, then, could he mean, but the Greek of his own day—the Greek then in fashion—the 24 letter Greek—the Greek which, according to the confession of the Misohierist himself, had in the space of three or four hundred years changed its old Phœnician form very much. It is a pity there should not be one scrap of their prodigious learning remaining, to prove, at least, the shape of their letters; but perhaps those learned men had no more care for letters than their public business required. Assuming, however, that these letters were 17 in number, he proceeds to argue thus for the antiquity of the Celts. “It is probable,” he says, “that the nation amongst whom the fewest and most simple letters are found, will be the oldest:”† therefore, *à fortiori*, that nation will be the oldest which has none; therefore the Chicasaws and Cherokees, the Hottentots and Esquimaux, are the *ne plus ultra* of antiquity. But why does he keep such a stir about an alphabet of 17 letters, in the face of Mr. Innes's evidence that the genuine Irish had 18, and when his own specimen of a Druidical alphabet, the Bethluisnion, contains 22? But Rudbeck the Swede maintains, that at the siege of Troy the Phœnician alphabet had 22 letters, and the Greek only 16. Mr. Higgins, therefore, must be of opinion, that the Greek is the older of the two; and upon this principle the Chinese must have greatly mistaken their antiquity: theirs must be quite a mushroom alphabet, a creature of yesterday; for its letters, according to Père Le Compte, amount to 80,000. The truth is, that young alphabets are limited to 16 or 17; as they grow old they increase in stature; the Bardic, for instance, has increased to 36 and 40. The Egyptian alphabet of phonetic signs contains 120; and it is a sound argument of the antiquity of the language used by Moses, that it had 22 letters. However, it is to be observed, that since the Samaritan alphabet was not the same as the Phœnician, and, though sprung from the same stock, not used by

* P. 12.

† P. 23.

the same people, the Jews may have had their 22 letters at the same time when the Phœnicians had only 16 or 17; and, therefore, it is a false conclusion of Mr. Higgins, that there must have been a migration of the latter before they were expelled by Joshua.* But if there was, the date of their leaving Phœnicia will not be the date of their arrival in Britain, and so cannot prove their antiquity in these Islands; for while the old settlers were improving their alphabet, the young swarms were traversing Europe: this is his own theory. But an Irish antiquary, in the "*Collectanea de rebus Hibernicis*," will not allow even half the date of Joshua to the Punic connection; he says the first colonization of Ireland by the Celtic aborigines (not Phœnician) was between 640 and 700 before Christ, and the Punic traders first arrived 200 years afterwards.

Our author's speculation upon the origin of the Hiberno-Celtic alphabet is still more extraordinary; he asserts that "the Irish, Greek, Hebrew and Samaritan alphabets have all been called after English trees, or the English trees after them."† Let us see how this is made out: Elm is certainly like Ailm, but not at all like Alpha or Aleph; Yew has a sort of resemblance to Jod, and Birch begins with the same letter as Beth and Beta; but none of the rest have even the similarity of alliteration; they are as different sounds as can be imagined: for instance, what has Ivy to do with Gimel, Gamma, or Goot? what has Oak to do with Daleth, Delta, or Duir? However, the Misohierist is intrepid, and finds out a "striking" likeness between Vine and Muin, Mu and Mem. We were not aware that the Vine was an English tree, and the famous Celtic bard, Taliesin, was so ignorant, as to substitute for it the Raspberry-tree. Perhaps the "many thousand years" which Mr. Higgins supposes to have elapsed since the arrival of his Celts, may have effected an alteration in the climate. Still it may be thought somewhat remarkable, that thirteen of the Irish letters should be names of trees; but it will be found, upon inquiry, that it was a common practice to affix arbitrary and cabalistic meanings to names of letters, which had other significations of their own. Beyer, indeed, falling into the same error, affirms that each of the Chaldean or Hebrew letters derives its name from some tree or shrub; but then they are all totally different from those assigned to them by Mr. Higgins. Beth is not the Birch, but the Thorn; Daleth is not the Oak, but the Vine; Vau is not the Alder, but the Palm; Jod is not the Yew, but the Ivy: the others, with the exception of the Apple, are certainly not English; the Pomegranate, the Mulberry, the Cedar and the Pine. Mr. Davies, in his "*Celtic Researches*," has noticed a Druidical alphabet, in

* P. 262.

† P. 24.

which "each of the letters received its name from some tree or plant of a certain species, regarded as being in some view or other descriptive of its power; and these names are still retained." The reverse of this process is rather more probable; trees obtained their names from letters, as a method of distinction at the dawn of science, and when certain virtues belonging to them were either discovered, or imagined, the notion of some mysterious power was communicated to the letters themselves. But either of these suppositions is equally fatal to the hypothesis of Mr. Higgins, to which it is time that we should introduce the reader.

According to his ingenious suggestion, the first mute alphabet consisted of leaves; leaves represented trees, and trees represented letters; and these symbols of a symbol were strung together to form words. Thus, if we would spell Godfrey, we must go out into the woods and gather a leaf of the Ivy (G), of the Spindle (O), of the Oak (D), of the Alder (F), of the Elder (R), of the Aspen (E), and of the Yew (Y);*—a very healthy mode of learning to spell, no doubt, and much to be preferred to confinement in a school-room, and sad meditations upon A, B, C; but very inconvenient for the purpose of communicating knowledge. Has Mr. Higgins yet to learn that leaves soon shrivel, and dry up, and crumble to pieces, and therefore cannot be kept for filing, like newspapers? or if they were to be always fresh, a botanical garden would be required near every student's house, and a considerable stock, too, of preliminary knowledge; for we much suspect that there are many well-bred ladies and gentlemen of the present day, who would be sadly puzzled by the Quicken-tree, and must go to school again to distinguish the Spindle from the Birch. However, he fortifies himself in his opinion by an authority from Virgil.† He imagines that the Sibyll used this alphabet at the Cumæan cave; but here again he is wrong, the Sibyll wrote her answers *on* the leaves (*in foliis descripsit*),‡ and the fear of Æneas was not only the disturbance of the leaves, but lest they should be entirely carried away by the violence of the wind (*ne volent rapidis ludibria ventis*);§ and it was not the *letters* which the prophetess cared not to re-arrange, but the *lines* (*carmina*).|| But all this is mere trifling. Of the origin of alphabets there can be little doubt: the first records of events were pictures, like those of Mexico; with which, by the way, Mr. Higgins seems to have a very limited acquaintance. A man and his wife in a boat, and a bird with a branch in its mouth, were memorials of the deluge. But when accidents and qualities were to be expressed, the difficulty was greater, and the method more circuitous. Pictures of

* P. 26.

† Lib. iii. verse 446.

§ Lib. vi. verse 76.

† P. 29.

|| Lib. iii. verse 452.

common objects lent their initial sounds to form successively an unrepresentable word, and the ear was called in to aid the eye; the figures formative of a single word were connected under a common bond, and hence those "*literæ ignorabiles*"* of Apuleius, which he remarked in certain books, "*partim figuris animalium concepti sermonis compendiosa verba suggerentes, partim nodosis, et in modum rotæ tortuosis, capreolatinque condensis apicibus.*" Perhaps we may recognise in the latter part of this description, the divining *sprigs* but not the *leaves* of the Druids. If the Chaldæans, before their alphabet was regularly formed, had wished to record that Mr. Higgins wrote a book, the pictures of a Yorkshireman and a book might have sufficed; but if they were such villainous critics as to add, that it was a bad one, they would have expressed the word, bad, by a house, an ox, and a gate, Beth being a house, Aleph an ox, and Daleth a door or gate. Thus in the Egyptian alphabet, a lion represented the sound of L, because *labo* was a lion, and a hand represented T, because *tot* was a hand. Now it is evident that the varieties of trees are too remote from the necessities of life, and bear too much resemblance to one another, to be available in this respect. If any one doubts this, let him only look at old Gerarde, or any of our ancient herbalists, and judge whether it is an easy thing to recognise a tree from its portrait, even in an age so little removed from our own. And for the nature of the emblems, we would refer him to Plutarch,† who says that Alpha was the first letter, because in Phœnician it meant a cow, which is the first necessary of life. We do not deny that the leaves arranged according to Mr. Higgins's plan may have formed a tolerable cypher for secret correspondence, and this in point of fact is the real history of the famous Bethluisnion alphabet.

"It owes its origin," says Mr. Beauford,‡ "to the monks of the middle ages, who composed it from the Hebrew, Greek, and Arabic alphabets, as an Abraxas, or secret character, wherein to write their charms and incantations. Having lost the form of their Bobeloth and Bethluisnion, they applied their names to the Abicetoria, which they put in the order of those ancient characters, to give them the greater appearance of antiquity; and hearing from some of their poems and chronicles that the ancient Irish wrote upon wood and the bark of trees, they imagined their letters bore the name of trees; in consequence of which they have interpreted the names of the Bethluisnion to signify so many trees, though they have *no such signification in any language upon earth.*"

After this it is unnecessary to say more; but yet to preclude even

* Metam. l. 2.

† Symp. p. 1047, vol. vi.

‡ Druidism Revived, coll. 2. p. 198.

a last lingering glance of fondness for the prostrate hypothesis, on account of its furnishing so ready an etymology to our word "leaves," as applied to a book, it may be as well to add, that it is derived from the Irish word *leabo* a book. The ancient books were composed of thin tablets of wood. Such were the Peithenon which the Druids used.* As it may be some consolation to Mr. Higgins, to find that others can speculate upon alphabets as "wildly" as himself, we will subjoin the following droll explanation of the Hebrew alphabet from Eusebius.† The five first letters mean, The erudition of a house is in the multitude of its books: the three next—By it the living lives: the two next—It is a good beginning: the two next—Learn, however: the three next—That out of them is everlasting help: the three next—The source and mouth of righteousness: the four last—*κλησις κεφαλῆς καὶ ὀδόντων σημεῖα*—which we leave to better scholars to explain as they can.

4. With respect to pronunciation, our author falls into a most comical blunder,‡ which, if he had not dealt so learnedly in alphabets, might almost justify a suspicion, that he does not know much of his own: he derives Cadiz from Gafis, by Digamma changing the F into D, and the instances he gives are *οις*, oves, *αοργον*, avernum, &c. Now it is well known that, as in the instances he cites, the Digamma F has retained, in Latin derivatives from the Greek, some affinity to the original sound of that singular letter which the Greeks somehow lost: but what has it to do with D? or who ever imagined before, that labials and dentals are interchangeable?—at least in the Celtic languages, it is quite impossible.§ It is difficult even to conjecture the cause of this strange confusion, unless indeed it be, what we strongly suspect, that Digamma begins with D, and therefore oves should be pronounced odes, and vinum, dinum. Again, Cadiz being still the subject of his speculation, he gravely announces that C was *formerly* pronounced K: does he mean to say that it is pronounced otherwise now? However, having settled these matters to his satisfaction, he proceeds to insinuate a connection between Cadiz and Gabis: but Mr. Roberts thinks the latter too far to the East for the Cimmerii: upon which he slily remarks that it is curious. He would not have dismissed it so perfunctorily, if he had known that Gabee, which is probably the Gabas of Arrian, and the Gabaza of Curtius, is placed by D'Anville exactly in the situation assigned by himself to Samarcand, about the site of Kogend. One more specimen of his skill in pronunciation will suffice: the pronoun ye, is it a monosyllable or a dissyllable?

* Druidism Revived, p. 271. † Præp. Evan. l. 10, p. 474. ‡ P. 101.

§ See this rule laid down in Walters's grammar.

The vulgar herd will decide for the monosyllable; far otherwise the better instructed Mr. Higgins: y-o-u should say y-e. This, at least, is exactly the mode in which he would have those letters pronounced in the word which Usher's correspondent used to express to English ears the sound given by the Samaritans to יהוה yehueh, y-e-hu-eh.*

5. We have next some observations to make upon his geography.† He pitches on latitude 45° , and the longitude of Samarcand for the spot where the Ark rested after the deluge, somewhere among the mountains of Bactriana.‡ And in another part he says, that the Celts, having been settled from the first in that country, are the people described by the Persian poets as residing in Samarcand. He believes, therefore, that Samarcand is in latitude 45° . Giving him, however, the full benefit of the utmost limits within which he confines the wanderings of the Gomerians, that is to say, the latitudes 40° and 50° , we affirm that Samarcand is not within those limits. Ulugh Beigh, the great astronomer of Samarcand in the middle of the 15th century, fixes its latitude at $39^{\circ} 37'$. Neither is there any probability that it was the first capital built after the flood, as he imagines.§ The memoirs of the Emperor Baber, written by himself in the language of Turkestan in Bactriana, more than 300 years ago, directly contradict this notion. They state that it was founded by Sekander, that is, Alexander; and that no great monarch before Taimur Beg (Tamerlane) ever made it the seat of his government. He directed its wall to be paced round the rampart, and found the circumference to be about five miles; no great area for the first capital of the world. But now, since he has determined that we are to look for the earliest population after the flood, and the source of languages, arts and sciences, between the fortieth and fiftieth parallels, east of the Caspian sea, let us proceed to inquire what sort of a country it is,—this nursery of mankind, this thickly peopled hive, which sent out swarm after swarm to carry its customs and language even to the ends of the earth. He himself is of course enchanted with it, and speaks with rapture of the delicious climate, from 45° to 50° . He supposes that the whole must be a continued sheepwalk, and quotes with approbation the Abbé Pezron,|| who speaks of its richness and fertility; nay, so deeply is he smitten with his day dreams of this paradise, that he hints an intention to seek enjoyment there himself. However, if he will take the advice of a friend, he will pause till he has heard the witnesses on the other side. Cluverius describes it thus: "It is a region for the most part uncultivated, melancholy, horrid, and desert. Quintus Curtius says, that a

* P. 25.

† P. 56.

‡ P. 267.

§ P. 78.

|| P. 56.

great part is covered with barren sand, a region hideous from drought, and sustaining neither man nor corn. Sogdiana (which is to the north of Bactriana but within the fiftieth parallel, and assigned by Ptolemy to the Gomeri) is for the most part a desert, through almost eighty *stadia* in breadth, full of vast solitudes. The whole Bactrian force assembled to resist the invasion of Alexander, though every man in those hordes is a soldier, amounted to no more than 30,000 men." Marco Polo, speaking of the desert of Lop* between 40° and 50°, says, travellers must provide victuals for a *month* to *cross* it only; for to go *through it lengthways would require a year's time*. The Emperor Baber describes Ferghâna, which has Kashgar on the east and Samarcand on the west, and therefore lies in the same latitude, as the extreme boundary of the habitable world. If we come to more recent times, in 1820 a Russian slave observed to Baron Meyendorff, that it was a country which God must have created in his wrath; and we have the baron's own account of his journey from Orenbourg to Bokhara, to justify the slave. If we follow his progress southward from latitude 50°, we shall find the first 150 miles a steppe characterized by aridity, uniformity, and a dreary silence—only a few prickly shrubs here and there, and the soil encrusted with salt: 250 miles more, south of the Moughodjar hills, brought him to the Jaxartes, through a level uniform country apparently burnt up; no river or rivulet all the way, nor water, except salt lakes; a wide-spreading desert of moving sands. Only on the line of the Jaxartes was there a plain twelve or fourteen miles wide, *tolerably* covered with tall reeds and grass. This is the favourite latitude of 45°, and here in November the thermometer was at 9½°. Sixty miles south of the Jaxartes, he came to jungles, reeds, swamps, splashes of water, and hillocks of sand. Then seventy or eighty miles across the desert of Kizilcoun without water, to a mountainous country. Was it on these mountains the Ark rested? Beyond them, there remained twenty miles more of sand, and it was not till he had nearly reached the fortieth parallel, about sixty or seventy miles from Bokhara, that the scene changed from a barren desert to a well-cultivated country. Lastly, another Russian, Captain Mouraviev, travelled from the eastern coast of the Caspian to Khiva on the Oxus over a desert, if possible, more destitute of water and vegetation; the very image of desolation: and the Oasis of Khiva is not more than 100 miles square.

The mountains mentioned by Baron Meyendorff must certainly be the Ararat of Mr. Higgins, for he makes his Gomerians first "take a direction north, then westwards nearly *along the forty-fifth* parallel of N.L."† Upon this hypothesis, the

* Harris's Voyages and Travels.

† P. 67.

second day's march would bring them into the sea of Aral, the fourth into the Caspian, and by the end of another week they would wade through the Bosphorus: before their clothes were well dry they would next plunge into the Euxine, and being thus perfectly amphibious, we see no reason why the Atlantic should stop them. We suspect (to use his own style of reasoning) that they walked through to America. But he continues—"One swarm arrived on the Euxine, and there settled, and gave *it* the name of the Cimmerian Bosphorus." It? what—the Euxine or the settlement? neither, certainly. The strait was the Bosphorus. But let us follow the Gomerian march: "Along the line pointed out," he says, "they would pass the rivers about the middle of their courses. And seas there were none, and yet they would naturally keep inclining towards the southern sun." Now along latitude 45° we have shown that there are seas, and after doubling the Caspian, they would cross the Volga and the Dnieper near their mouths, and the Danube, to get into Greece. Again—there is "not a single chain of mountains of any consequence." Are the Rhetian Alps, the Carpathian and Hercynian mountains, between these latitudes, of no consequence? However, if he had been content to make the tide of population roll westward slowly and gradually, filling up in its progress all the choicest spots below the fiftieth parallel, which were not pre-occupied by those who crossed the Mediterranean, it will be easy to understand, why traces of their course may be discovered throughout the whole extent assigned to it. But his impatience to bring them into the British Isles will not suffer this. In his view, they were a torrent rapidly pouring its restless stream through the fairest portion of Europe; and since, by his own admission, the direction of the current was always to the lower latitudes, the emigrants would prefer the sunny plains south of the mountain ranges; and, entering by the level of the coast, would spread themselves over Italy and Spain and the South of France, without anything to tempt them to leave those pleasant quarters and "delicious climates," till, after a long lapse of time, they were straitened by the increase of population. Nevertheless, we are willing to help him out of this difficulty by a suggestion, which a better acquaintance with Bactriana might have taught him. In that country there is no population except upon the banks of rivers. His Celts, therefore, would by habit cling to the banks of rivers, whenever they could. Upon reaching the Danube, they would ascend to its source, which would bring them near to the Rhine and the Rhone; some might be tempted to cross it, and mounting along the course of the Drave, and the Save, would soon find themselves in Italy. But after all, there is

no small degree of absurdity in tracing whole nations through 2,000 years up to the family of one grandson of Noah.* Why are Scythians, and Hindoos, and Chaldeans, and Greeks, and Romans, and Gauls, and Spaniards, and Welsh, and Irish, and Scotch, all to be branches of the same people—descendants from Gomer? General Vallancey puts in an equal claim for Magog: and Peritsol describes the Caspian as situated between deserts in the regions belonging to Gomer and Magog. Zonaras, too, deduces the Scythæ from Magog. Now we learn from the Scholiast upon Apollonius, that Timonax, an old historian, reckoned fifty different nations of Scythæ: for the Greeks were accustomed to call the northern nations by that name,† till, upon better acquaintance with them in the west, they distinguished them into Celtæ, Iberi, &c. By some the Scythæ are held to be Cuthæi, descendants from Cush; by some, the Chaldæans or Chasdim are referred to the same origin. On the other hand Josephus assures us, that they were anciently called Arphaxadæi; so that they have had the good fortune to be assigned to all the three sons of Noah.

Apropos of this word Chaldeans, how comes Mr. Higgins to say, that its derivation from Chasdim is what no one denies,‡ when just before he had himself deduced it from Khaldt, a wood, or from Whittaker's Galt, a woodlander?§ Again, we have the authority of Sanchoniatho, for believing that the Phœnicians, whose language was almost Irish, were descendants of Ham; for he says that Chna, i. e. Canaan, was the first who took the name of Phœnician; even the Cambri have no relationship of name to Gomer, if Mr. Walters be correct in his etymology, who derives it from Cyn, first or original, and Bro, region or country; which coincides with the tradition mentioned by Cæsar, that they were the aborigines of the island, and certainly has a nearer affinity to Cimbri, Cambria, and Cumbria, than Gomer has. He admits that the Belgæ,|| when they came to Ireland, were a mixed race; and is not this the plain truth throughout? and though some curiously-connecting links may be discovered here and there, accidentally, in names and customs, is it not absurd to suppose, that the offspring of any single family could pass through the world, as some rivers are said to do through lakes, without mingling their waters with the surrounding fluid? So much indeed is he aware, at last, of this inconvenience in his theory, that he tries to back out of it,¶ by declaring that he is only concerned to prove that his Celts came from the east of the Caspian sea, and brought with them their seventeen letters, their festivals, and their gods; but still he

* P. 54—68.

§ P. 192.

† Strabo, lib. i. p. 35.

|| P. 98.

‡ P. 194.

¶ P. 100.

is wrong. Unfortunately, the Irish antiquarians inform us, that a certain Druid, called Forehern, obtained the use of letters from Punic or Iberian traders, about the beginning of the last century preceding the Christian æra. Of course their Phœnician gods were derived from the same source, with the exception of those whom all the idolatrous Noachidæ worshipped, the fathers of the human race, whose memory was preserved in mysterious rites through very many centuries in every part of the globe,* and the traces of it are not yet worn out; and their festivals, except in so far as they related to that tremendous catastrophe, could not well agree chronologically, for their computation of time was different. The Celtic year began in July; the eastern, in September or March. The Umbrians, who on account of their Etruscan alphabet,† are claimed as first cousins, reckoned their day from noon to noon, but the Celts began their reckoning at night.

6. His excursions in chronology are still more weak and unsuccessful. In the first place, half afraid to expose opinions on this subject,‡ which he suspects of heresy, he seeks for shelter under the wing of Mr. Faber,—to whom, although a priest, he is really civil, for he speaks of him as a very celebrated and learned, orthodox, modern Church-of-England priest,§ of the evangelical sect; this is a very honourable testimony from a Misohierist, and perfectly just, but it is oddly expressed. Mr. Faber is both orthodox and evangelical, but he is of no sect. Yet, notwithstanding this panegyric, Mr. Faber will leave him to fight his own battles against Moses and the Mosaic chronology, if such be his intention; for be it known to Mr. Higgins, that whichever may be right, the Samaritan chronology, adopted by Mr. Faber, is just as much Mosaic as the Hebrew. It may ease his mind a little on this subject, to inform him, that Desvignoles has collected two hundred different calculations of the age of the world, of which more than a hundred are given in “*L’Art de Verifier les Dates*,” the greatest amount being 6,984 in Muller’s tables, who lived under Alphonso X. of Castille, and died in 1284. Next, as to the famous well in Egypt, at Syene, he acknowledges,|| that if ever there was any truth in the story told by Strabo, of its being within the tropics, and therefore reflecting the entire image of the sun, it must have been no less than 3,600 years before his time; and yet he hugs this idle tale, this loose tradition, which must have been far more uncertain at that time, than any relating to the oldest monument extant is to us, the interval being nearly equal, and the means of obtaining information infinitely less, and ushers it in with this pompous defiance to the priests: “I think it proper

* See Bryant and Faber.

† P. 159.

§ P. 134.

‡ Aulus Gellius, lib. iii. l. 2.

|| P. 159.

to produce one more example, to show that the systems of Usher, Blair, and *all the remainder of our priests*, are wrong. I think the following history will give their systems the coup-de-grace, &c." This is plainly a case of parturient mountains. What credit is due to Strabo and Diodorus, he might have learned from the evidence of Herodotus, which unfortunately goes so far as to prove the well within the tropics *in his own time*. In general, the Misohierist is not over civil to these Grecians, but here he takes the evidence of Herodotus, which is palpably untrue, and labours to twist it into something like truth, for the sake of having a fling at the priests. His proof of the antiquity of the world, from the measurement of the celestial arc between Alexandria and Syene, by Eratosthenes, is equally unfortunate. Did Eratosthenes, who lived two centuries before the Christian era, suppose that Syene was within the tropics in his own time?—he was not so bad an astronomer. Did he use in his measurement a meridian, which had not been the true meridian of the well for more than 3,000 years?—he was not so great a fool; but still it is said that he made use of the well. Let us see what a much better judge of these matters than Mr. Higgins conjectures to be the fact. "It is very improbable," says Laplace, in his History of Astronomy, "that this great astronomer should have been contented with the coarse observation of a well enlightened by the sun; this consideration, and the relation of Cleomedes, authorize us to conclude, that he observed the shadow of the gnomon, at the summer and winter solstices, both at Syene and at Alexandria; and in this manner he obtained the latitude of these two cities, very nearly such as it has been found by modern observations." Again, Mr. Maurice having ingeniously suggested that the Maypoles and Tauric festivals in May, were obscure commemorations of the vernal equinox in the constellation Taurus, at the creation, see what marvellous results he deduces from it: "This points to a period for the building of Stonehenge or Abury, which will astonish most persons who have not been accustomed to examine subjects of this kind."* This is the truest observation in his book. "5,832 years look very near our orthodox date of the creation." Why that is the very point that Maurice designed to prove: when the sun first shone upon the world, his situation in the heavens was among the stars of Taurus, and then was the first vernal equinox; hence the era of creation has ever since been celebrated by the worship of the bull, or by other rites, on the first of May. No, says Mr. Higgins, it was not the world that was created near 5,832 years ago, but Abury and Stonehenge. It is not easy to make out the connection in his mind, between Stonehenge and the sun in

* P. 158.

Taurus, unless it be that it must have been built at that time, because it was designed for the celebration of Tauric festivals; hence, by the same process of reasoning, it may be proved that every church in England, nay, in every part of Christendom, was built about the time of our Saviour's nativity, for they certainly have been built for the celebration of that event. Much the same sort of confusion he makes, in the ridicule with which he treats the notion of Krishna's history being a later invention than the Christian era. It may, or it may not—but his reason is a very bad one,* because "his statue is to be found in the very oldest caves and temples throughout all India;" as if the history and the statue were not different things, and as if the one might not be invented to account for the other. Another argument, by which he endeavours to establish the high antiquity of the world, is the removal of the Tauric festival from the 1st of May to the 1st of April, when the equinox ceased to take place in Taurus;† but yet he himself testifies that both festivals are observed both in India and in Britain. What then was the change? There was indeed a great change in the state of the world at the deluge, which would most probably introduce another festival, in addition to that of the vernal equinox. But the argument on which he chiefly relies is, the truth of the Indian calculations, which, he stoutly maintains, were not back-reckonings, but "*real and true observations*,"‡ in spite of Sir W. Jones, and all his *plausible reasoning*. Upon this point it is quite needless to dispute; the question has been set at rest by the highest modern authority in matters of astronomy, notwithstanding "the nonsense which has been written against the antiquity of the Hindoo astronomy."§

"The Indian epochs," says Laplace, "which go back, one to the year 3102, the other to the year 1491, B. C., are connected with the mean motions of the sun, moon, and planets, in such a manner, that one is evidently fictitious. Notwithstanding the arguments brought forward by Bailli, to prove that the first of these epochs is founded on observation, I am still of opinion that it was *invented* for the purpose of giving a common origin to all the motions of the heavenly bodies in the zodiac; in fact, computing according to the Indian tables, from the year 1491 to 3102, we find a general conjunction of the sun and all the planets, as these tables suppose, but their conjunction differs too much, from the result of our best tables, to have ever taken place; which shows that the epoch to which they refer was *not* established by observation."—vol. ii. p. 250.

7. We propose to give some specimens of our author's critical acumen. 1. He attributes|| to Diodorus Siculus an assertion, that the Druids brought the sun and moon near them, and he refers to the

* P. 156.

† P. 153.

‡ P. 155.

§ P. 159.

|| P. 114.

sixth book; this he must have taken from some one, who knew no more about the matter than himself. The passage to which he appeals, and which he afterwards unknowingly quotes without any reference, is not in the sixth book, of which only a very small fragment is extant, but in the second; and it is not there asserted, that the inhabitants of an island, west of the Celtæ, brought the sun and moon near them, but that the moon had quite the appearance of not being far from the earth. This is doubtless mythological, (for the moon was worshipped upon the Celtic hills,) and had nothing to do with the telescope, of which the Druids knew no more than the man in the moon; and if, instead of playing at dominoes with the parcels of stones counted in Druidical circles, and arranging them at pleasure in such a way as to form astronomo-oid, for they are not astronomical, numbers, he would attend to the mythology of the Celts, he might obtain the true history of the *two small circles* at Abury, inclosed by *one large* one. Probert, a Welchman, who has translated the Gododin, writes thus: "The bards taught that there were three regions of existence, which they called circles; the lowest they called Elbred, or Evil, containing matter, form, and existence; the second, Gwynwyd, or Felicity, in which virtuous men are to exist for ever; and the third, Cylch y Cagant, or the All-inclosing Circle, which God alone pervades." 2. He makes Flbrus say, "the city of Veii, if there ever was such a place."* Florus says no such thing. The ground for this assertion is a strong rhetorical contrast drawn by the historian between its former wealth and its total disappearance afterwards. "Hoc tum Veientes fuere; nunc fuisse quis meminit? quæ reliquiae, quodve vestigium? laborat annalium fides, ut Veios fuisse credamus." 3. Since,† in the eleventh chapter of Genesis, he admits the propriety of the interpretation adopted by Bryant, which understands the expression "they travelled from the east," as a partial movement of some families only, without reference to the preceding verse, it is extraordinary that he did not perceive this consequence—that his speculations about Ararat are wholly inconclusive. Moses does not say that they journeyed *direct* from Ararat to Shinar; some considerable time must have intervened; and the descendants of Ham, roaming in search of a separate subsistence, may have settled first in Bactriana, if he will have it so, or rather in Khorasan, and Trak, and thence travelled from the east. Upon reaching the Araxes, it would be most natural to pursue its course to the Caspian, and to spread themselves along its southern coasts; or if, at first steering their course somewhat more to the westward, they descended the Euphrates, that river would bring them to the land of Shinar, by an *eastward* course,

* P. 102.

† P. 39.

for *eastward* is the marginal interpretation, instead of *from the east*. Either of these suppositions is fatal to his peremptory conclusion, that "if the book be true, the mount where the ark rested cannot be between the two seas;"* and we will venture to say, that the name of Ararat, which is not improbably derived from the Celtic, Ar-Aorth, (Mount of the Ship,) its old Phœnician name, Baris, (the Ship or Ark,) and the name by which it has immemorially been familiar to the Armenians, the Mount of Descent, are far stronger circumstances in its favour, than the tradition of the Hindoos can countervail. But we cannot expect much exactness of criticism from a person, who argues that because the Hebrew and Samaritan copies differ in some places, he may transpose passages *ad libitum*, even in those where they coincide. On this account we are the less surprised at meeting with such blunders as these. In Numbers, xiii. 20, † עַז not אַז, as he writes it, has not the most remote connection with knowledge, unless it be through the *tree* of knowledge; nor have any of the eastern translators made this grand discovery, with which the Irish "Aos" has inspired him. It means a tree, or wood, as it is rightly rendered in our version. His etymology of Barrow from the Hebrew is singularly unhappy. באר-רוע, Bar-ruo, he says, "signifies a thrown-up pit of commination or lamentation." ‡ To talk of a thrown-up pit is rank nonsense. באר is a well; how can it be thrown up? It is the reverse of a tumulus; as רוע is of lamentation: it is a merry noise—a jubilant vociferation. גור does not mean "a collection of people:" the *verb* is sometimes, but rarely, used for gathering together, as in Isaiah, liv. 15, and for assembling, as Hosea, vii. 14; but there is no noun which has that sense. He professes not to "understand the derivation of the word *tumulus*." It is evidently from *tumeo*, which is perhaps from תום, *an onion*, from its swelling form which made it a Celtic and Egyptian emblem of the sphere. But why does he suspect it is modern Latin? it is as old as Virgil. חג-גור || does not mean "assembling the people to dance:" חג is a solemnity, a festival; and therefore the verb "Chagag" accidentally means *saltare*, as one mode of festivity; but in the only place where it is rendered dancing, 1 Sam. xxx. 16, it might be equally well translated rejoicing. קתר, ¶ Kether is not *circulus* but *rupes* in Chaldee, and so the Irish "Cathair," which afterwards came to signify a city, was first the habitation of their divinity in rocks.

Rough-hewn stone** is a very bad translation of ξεσος λιθος. He renders פוויים, magnets; †† but Hutchinson has led him into this error, unreasonably enough: it is usually rendered pearls, or

* P. 39.

‡ P. 231.

† P. 84.

¶ P. 235

‡ P. 231.

** P. 237.

§ P. 231.

†† P. 112.

rubies, and the sense, as in Job, xxviii. 18, shows that one or the other is right, because they are articles of the greatest value; and in that passage the question is not concerning the attractiveness of wisdom, but its value beyond everything else that is valuable. $\gamma\omega\mu$ in that passage does not mean attraction, but extension either of time, weight, price, or quantity; and hence the three last senses have all been attributed to it by lexicographers. Passionei gives the first—weight: our Bible gives the second, in Psalm cxxvi.—“precious seed:” and the margin gives the third—a basket of seed. This gives us an option of three senses; either magnitude of wisdom, or weight of wisdom, or the value of wisdom is to be preferred before pearls. Bochart has suggested a fourth—the obtaining of wisdom; *extractio sapientiae* is more difficult than the extraction of pearls from the depth of the ocean. The same writer has shown, that the ancients called the shell *pinna*, and the fishery *πινναλον*. In the Lamentations of Jeremiah, iv. 7, the sense of the passage is entirely lost by this interpretation of Peninnim. The prophet is setting forth, in the strongest terms, the former excellency of the professors of a severe religion in Jerusalem. Her Nazarites were purer than snow, whiter than milk, redder than rubies, or, according to the Syriac, the cornelian; or the delicate flesh-coloured tint of some pearls, which is the sense preferred by some translators, would furnish a beautiful comparison: but Bochart suggests a rendering of this last clause, which is certainly more in unison with the preceding comparisons, “having more lustre than pearls.” But the loadstone has neither lustre, nor redness; or even if some specimens have, as Mr. Hutchinson says, the colour of reddish clay, how would it answer the purpose? “Purer than snow, whiter than milk, redder than”—reddish clay! Oh, what a falling off were there. It would indeed be a fine specimen of the Bathos; and yet, it must be owned, it has many advocates. The trifling objections by which Mr. Higgins tries to prove corruption in the Hebrew text are probably his own.* “The 11th and 12th chapters of Genesis,” he says, “can be reconciled by no human ingenuity.” Where is the difficulty? It is stated that Terah lived seventy years before the birth of Abram, Nahor, and Haran, and, altogether, 205, Abram being seventy-five when he left his father’s house; but it is no where said, that at that time Terah died, or that Abram was the eldest. On the contrary, he married the daughter, as Bishop Patrick thinks, of his elder brother, Haran, who died before they left Ur, of the Chaldees. What is there to “overthrow the common rules of arithmetic”† in this? His

* P. 134.

† Ibid.

objection to Chapter xxxv. is much too hypercritical: but it is no proof of corruption in the Hebrew;* at the most, it is but a defect in style. Moses had related the birth of Benjamin at Ephrath, in Canaan: a few verses, afterwards, having enumerated all the sons of Jacob, he adds, "These are his twelve sons that were born to him in Padan Aram." Every reader, but Mr. Higgins, sees, at the first glance, that it must be understood, with an implied exception of the one, whose birth had been just related. One more instance of his skill, in correcting the Bible, shall suffice: it is in the first verse of Genesis. "The word heaven," says he, "used in our translation, is nonsense, because it conveys no definitive idea."† We needed not this information to satisfy us, that *his* ideas on this subject were very far from definite; since he gravely contends,‡ that the ancients knew as much of the form of the heavenly bodies as the moderns; because Strabo says, that the earth and the *heavens* are both *spherical*. But, perhaps, Strabo used it in the same sense as Moses did Shaimaim, which we now learn ought to have been rendered planets.§ The best of it is, that he appeals to the authority of the learned and orthodox Dr. Parkhurst, and adds, that he calls the planetary bodies "the disposers of the affairs of men."|| Let us confront this bold assertor, with the learned Doctor's own statement. "This (Shaimaim) is a descriptive name of the heavens, or of that immense *celestial fluid*, subsisting in the three conditions of fire, light, and spirit, or gross air, which fills every part of the universe, not possessed by other matter. It is, literally, the disposers; and this appellation was first given by God to the celestial fluid, when it began to act in disposing and arranging the earth and waters."

8. A few miscellaneous blunders shall be noted, of a more amazing character. 1. "From Tager," he says, "came the Latin and *English* word *agger*."¶ Indeed! how long is it since *agger* has been enfranchised and adopted into our tongue? We hope he will transmit this valuable intelligence to Mr. Todd for his next edition of Johnson. 2. He ascribes to Cicero a work upon Etymologies, which was written by Cornificius.** 3. He insists that the authors of the Chaldee Paraphrases lived *long after* the time of Christ;†† when, in point of fact, both Jonathan and Onkelos were nearly his contemporaries: it is generally supposed, that they lived in the reign of Tiberius. 4. He finds out, that "as fire was supposed to be the first principle of all things, it was also supposed, by a *peculiar refinement*, to be the destroyer."‡‡ To

* P. 135.

§ Ibid.

** P. 199.

† P. 305.

|| P. 179.

†† P. 159.

‡ P. 51.

¶ P. 219.

‡‡ P. 168.

us it seems, that it would be a much more peculiar refinement to deny or doubt, what every man may learn from his candle or his grate, the destroying power of fire. 5. He rails at Bede for not knowing Scotland from Ireland; as, in his *Chronicles*, he calls those *Scoti*, whom, in his *History*, he calls *Hiberni*. A serious charge, no doubt; a most heinous offence, for which he deserves to be stripped of his title, as he is by Mr. Higgins, and adjudged no longer worthy of Veneration; and with apparent justice: for poor Bede pleads guilty. He says, like Ligarius, *Habes quod accusatori est maxime optandum, confitentem reum*. But what if, after all, the *Scoti* and *Hiberni* were really the same people? It would be useless to bring Latin authorities to prove this fact, especially if they chanced to be from ecclesiastical writers, such as Prosper, Isidore, Bernard, Orosius, &c. The Misohierist would only scoff at their ignorance. Our witness, therefore, shall be a Celt of genuine Hiberno-Celtic origin. Mr. O'Connor, an Irish antiquary, writes thus: "Under Corbmac O'Cuinn, and his successors, the Irish people became known and celebrated in Europe by the name of Scotts—an appellation they *always* bore at home."* So that if any Scotchman is shocked at the imputation of Anthropophagic habits, attributed to his ancestors, he has to thank Mr. Higgins for it, and not Jerome. Happy it is for that learned Father, that he is not in Mr. Higgins's way: for such is the ferocity with which the Misohierist flies at him, that if he were still alive, he might have reason to fear that there were other cannibals besides the *Scoti*. "Jerome," he says, "deserved a flogging for a lie he told about angels flogging him."† Jerome, no doubt, was a hotheaded enthusiast, and ascetic; but the Misohierist's "memory" has certainly "deceived" him, if he thinks, that *his* is a fair and just representation of the fact. Jerome was in a high fever, and so nearly at Death's door, that preparations were making for his funeral, when, evidently in a state of delirium, he imagined himself dragged before the tribunal of Christ, where stripes were inflicted upon him by the angels. No one, with common charity, can doubt that this was the effect of a heated mind, acting upon a diseased body. It is true, he protests that it was no dream or fancy; *testis est judicium quod timui—ita mihi nunquam contingat in talem incidere quæstionem—liventes habuisse scapulas, plagas sensisse post somnum*. But as, on the one hand, he could not see his shoulders when he was lying upon his back almost dead, so, on the other, it was most natural that he should feel pain and soreness, attributed by his heated imagination to the events which delirium had left strongly impressed upon his memory.

* Collect. de Rebus Hibern.

† P. 97.

More sympathy might have been expected from Mr. Higgins for a case of mental disorder; it is a subject on which he has deeply interested himself, and not without benefit to the public: but, moreover, there is something extremely morbid, if not delirious, in his own ravings about Ishmael and Isaac. One scarcely knows which to pity most—his wish that the wild Arab may never be civilized, or his ignorance that Godfrey Higgins himself may very possibly be one of those “descendants of the pampered Isaac,”* *all* of whom, converted or unconverted, “have become a by-word of contempt and the slaves of slaves.” So Mr. Higgins assures us; but whatever he may think of the expulsion of Hagar, and its cruelty, Ishmael himself was not half so angry as he is with “the *pampered Isaac*,” or “his *doating father*.” For it is related, that both the sons assisted after Abraham’s death, to give him an honourable burial. 6. He seems to consider himself in possession of a great secret just discovered, when he announces the variations between the copies of the Hebrew Bible corrected by Ben Asher and Ben Napthali. “The Rabbies must not flatter themselves that this is unknown;”† for Mr. Higgins has found it out! However, “the schism,” it appears, has been at length “suppressed throughout all Europe.” How? by a Bishop’s defence of the Hebrew text, concerning the grounds and nature of which, it is plain that his ignorance is most profound. But 7thly, nothing marks more strongly the confusion in which facts lie jumbled in this author’s head, than his assertion, that the authors of the Reformation sat in the *Long Parliament*. For this is his courteous description of the great struggle that produced the ecclesiastical system established 200 years ago: “The fanatics of the Long Parliament beat the fanatics of the Pope.” Lastly, we pass over many minor mistakes, inconsistencies, and contradictions, to come to a misrepresentation more important than the rest: “Faith,” he says, “is proved by Mr. Locke to be a matter of necessity, not of choice; a man cannot choose to believe or not to believe; thus unbelief may be a misfortune, but can never be a crime.” If this can be proved by Mr. Locke, or Mr. Higgins, or any one else, Atheism is no sin, and total want of religion is no subject of punishment. But, in the mean time, let the disgrace of this demoralizing sentiment fall on the head of the fabricator. Mr. Locke is wholly guiltless of it. In his third Letter for toleration, he thus expresses himself: “You suppose the true religion may be manifested to all men, so far as to leave them, if they do not embrace it, without excuse *to God indeed*, but not to the magistrate.”‡ And again,

* P. 68.

† P. 132.

‡ P. 428.

speaking of faith, he says: "The man, who seeks not truth to the best of his power, must be accountable for whatever mistakes he runs into; otherwise, he misuses those faculties, which were given him to no other end but to search and follow the clearer evidence, and greater probability." Does this prove that faith is a matter of necessity—that the guilt of incredulity is nothing, or that unbelief can never be a crime? The intellect of Mr. Locke was cast in quite another mould: he knew, full well, that truth is like the precious ores, sometimes to be found on the surface, but, for the most part, not to be obtained without patience and pains, and long attention, and intellectual labour, and the incentive of a strong desire: for this end, reason and understanding were imparted to mankind; and he who shall waste them in idle sport, indifferent to the account which he must render of their use, will doubtless frustrate one great end of his existence; and no one can be surprised if he falls into the snare of many a delusion, and often mistakes lead for silver, and copper for gold.

By this time, if Mr. Higgins should peruse this article, he will probably have added one more to his many great discoveries, namely, that he has been in far too great a hurry, and that the laborious work, in which he was engaged, required a great deal more than a few months of consideration to secure it from innumerable faults. It may teach him, that ridicule and invective are dangerous weapons in unexperienced hands; that to be for ever talking of ignorance, prejudice, and nonsense, when he meets an opinion that differs from his own, is neither courteous nor discreet; and that there is much good sense in the advice of Reynolds, although he was a priest, and a bishop to boot—To correct and keep down the rising of our knowledge, with humility in ourselves, and charity to our brethren—not to censure every one, for dull and brutish, who in judgment varieth from our own conceits.—(Vol. iv. p. 296.)

ART. VII.—1. *Declarations of the Catholic Bishops, the Vicars Apostolical, and their Co-adjutors in Great Britain.* London. Keating and Brown. 1826. pp. 16.

2. *Review of a Pamphlet, entitled, "Declaration of the Catholic Bishops, the Vicars Apostolic, and their Co-adjutors, in Great Britain;" paragraph by paragraph. To which is added, An Appeal to the Roman Catholic Laity, who signed, "An Address to their Protestant Fellow Countrymen," founded upon*

that Declaration. By the Rev. George Townsend, M.A. Prebendary of Durham, and Vicar of Northallerton, &c. &c. London. Rivingtons. 1827. pp. 3s. 6d.

3. *The Protestant Dissenter's Catechism; containing, 1. A Brief History of the Dissenters. 2. The Reasons of Dissent from the National Church.* The Nineteenth Edition. With an Appendix and Prefaces, by William Newman, D.D. London. Holdsworth. 1827. pp. 86.
4. *The Case between the Church and the Dissenters impartially and practically Considered.* By the Rev. Francis Merewether, M.A. Rector of Cole Orton, Vicar of Whitwell, and Chaplain to the Most Noble the Marquis of Lansdowne. London. Rivingtons. 1827. pp. 166. 6s.

At the last quarterly meeting of the "British Catholic Association," a petition was proposed and adopted in favour of "their fellow-subjects, dissenters from the Established Church." The publications named at the head of this article will enable us, with a little foreign aid, to take a distinct view of the relative position of the two classes of his Majesty's subjects, whom it is the object of this petition to identify; the opinions which they profess to hold on some leading points, which show how far they can be supposed really to coalesce; what common ground they occupy on the present subject; and in what respect a coalition between them for any immediate purpose, can be conducive to their own or to the general welfare.

The Roman Catholics then maintain that the Church of Rome is "the mother and mistress of all Churches; and that true obedience (is due) to the Roman Pontiff, the successor of the Blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ."* The Dissenters, on the other hand, affirm of the Church of Christ, "that its supreme and ONLY" (by which, no doubt, they mean either in Heaven or Earth) "head is Jesus Christ."† Two more opposite opinions on the same subject cannot well be imagined. But the opposition will be still more striking, if we pursue these respective opinions into detail. The Romanist claims for the Church to which he belongs, and the Head of it, an absolute dominion over the faith of every one within its pale; allows none, in fact, to be within its pale, who do not recognise this dominion;

* As the "Declaration" has nothing *specific* on this point, we quote from the summary of the doctrines of the Council of Trent contained in the "Profession of Faith," from the Bull of Pope Pius IV. The words are:—"Sanctam, Catholicam, et Apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam, omnium Ecclesiarum matrem, et magistram agnosco: Romanorum Pontifici, B. Petri Apostolorum principis successori, ac Jesus Christi Vicario, veram obedientiam spondeo ac juro." *Sylloge Confessionum*, Oxon. 1824. see p. 5.

† Protestant Dissenter's Catechism, p. 28.

and says of those without its pale, that Christ is no Saviour or Redeemer for them. The "Declaration" (p. 15.) rebuts the charge of uncharitableness on this score, by saying, that "the doctrinal principle of exclusive salvation belongs to the law of Christ;" a position which cannot be denied, if it is meant thereby to say, that salvation is denied to such as wilfully either refuse the doctrines, or disobey the commandments of Christ. But is this what the Romanist means by his "exclusive salvation?" Certainly not: he accepts a collection of *dogmas*, several of which have no place in the revealed word of Christ and his Apostles; he is taught to call the system of faith thus made up, "*veram Catholicam Fidem, extrà quam nemo salvus esse potest.*" That this is the truth may be proved by a simple appeal to the short profession of Pius IV. from which these words are taken.

The Dissenters say that Christ is the "supreme and ONLY head" of his Church.* It may be important to observe here, that all Christians agree as to Christ's being the *only* head of the invisible Church, and the supreme head of the visible Church on earth also:—"far above all principality, and power,—and every name that is named not only in this world, but also in that which is to come." Yet at the same time there are Christians in this realm, and those not only very considerable in number, but among the highest and most influential of our community, whether in learning, station, or character, who are deliberately convinced, although Christ is the supreme "*head over all things to the Church,*" whether in heaven or on earth, visible or invisible; that there is nothing in Scripture to forbid, that there are many very important considerations to warrant, the principle of a temporal head also, to whom the government of the church as a society may fitly belong; although not any share in the execution of its ministerial offices. We are now, however, stating the Dissenters' creed on this point. They profess to hold that Christ is the supreme and only head of the Church, visible and invisible. For this they plead such texts as the following:—"Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you.—Be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your Master, even Christ, and ye all are brethren. And call no man your Father upon the earth; for one is your Father, which is in Heaven. Be not ye the servants of men. In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."† It is foreign from our present purpose to show how it is proved, by a host of learned and judicious writers, that the real and original meaning

* Catechism, p. 23.

† St. Matthew, xx, 25, 26.—xxiii. 8.—1 Corinthians, vii. 23.—Matthew, xv. 9.

of these texts is at an immeasurable distance from the point towards which the Dissenters endeavour to press them. We merely state that this is the Dissenters' creed, and that its consequences, expressed in their own words, are as follows:—

“The right of private judgment and liberty of conscience, *in opposition to all human authority in matters of religion.*” “In the affairs of religion every man ought to judge for himself, since every man must render an account of himself to God, who has given us an infallible rule in his word to guide us, and reasonable faculties to understand it; which private persons are as capable of using, to discover the way of truth and duty, as magistrates and large bodies of men.” “The word of God expressly forbids Christians giving up conscience to the direction of any man.”*

We do not propose to sift these propositions. We are not going to ask—whether without “giving up conscience,” a person may not lawfully in religion, as we know he does every day in matters of far less consequence, take advice of those who are in a situation to be better judges than himself. We will call attention for a moment only to Mr. Merewether's seasonable distinction between “conscience” (simply considered) and “*well-informed conscience*,”† to the latter of which, though not to the former, he properly gives unrestricted liberty. But we wish to ask this plain question—with such extreme opinions as those now stated, how can the Romanist and the English Dissenter possibly coalesce? One says, you must surrender your faith to the Church; the other says, you must have a faith of your own. It might not be unreasonable to point out here, how nicely the Church of England holds the balance between these two extremes; in releasing its members from the bondage of implicit submission; yet requiring them to “*receive with meekness the engrafted word*” from the lips of ministers, duly accredited and responsible to God for “*rightly dividing the word of truth.*” We confine ourselves, however, to the question: how can the Romanist and the Dissenter have any respect for each other's opinions on this subject? How can each wish the doctrines of the other to be diffused and accepted? Or, to come to the point at once, how can each desire to see the other strengthened, either by the accession of political privileges or the removal of political disabilities.

Another striking point of contrast between the parties before us, may be found in the “unity of faith.” It is often mentioned by the Romanists (as it is in the “Declaration,” p. 7.) as one of the treasures the Romish Church has *alone* the care of, and they represent the Pope as the centre of this union. We probably

* Dissenter's Catechism, p. 22, 23.

† Case between the Church and the Dissenters, p. 8.

shall not be sought for amongst the friends of religious disunion, either in principle or practice; if we are, we certainly shall not be found there. We are even willing at once to admit, that this pretension of the Romish Church is one of the most alluring they have to produce: we allow that if their means of securing it were effectual, they would have strong claims on general acceptance; we are firmly convinced, that in Protestant countries no one circumstance gives such substantial strength to Popery, as the religious divisions among Protestants themselves. But then let us examine how far the Romish system of faith and discipline is calculated to secure unity? First, as to its tendencies—is a blind un-inquiring assent required by a church, however *specious* it may appear, a *real* and *firm* step towards religious union? We say, unhesitatingly, far from it. There have been, are, and ever will be, master-spirits in the world, who will burst from the yoke thus put on their understandings; and will teach mankind to “*stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made (them) free.*” With the Bible in their hands, though perhaps only in a tongue unknown to the bulk of Christendom, there are learned men, who will have honesty enough, as well as learning, to tell the people, that there is no precept in Scripture, which obliges them to go thus hood-winked to their religious faith, their religious worship, or their religious practice. And then, when the juggle is discovered, what a door is at once opened to religious disunion! The boasted authority of the Church, borrowed from these unfounded claims, being set at nought, the opposite extreme of licentiousness is almost sure to follow. This may be, this has been. But even where the fraud (for what else is it?) is not exposed, where Church authority is clung to, and set at its highest, and made to proclaim the danger of differing from dogmas and dictates, so as to obtain ostensible acquiescence; even in the bosom of the Romish Church itself, and amongst its conforming members, has unity been in fact always preserved; has disunion been, in fact, always avoided? Upon this subject the words of the intrepid and uncompromising Jewell deserve our regard:—

“Verum, O Deus bone, quinam isti tandem sunt, qui dissensiones in nobis reprehendunt? An verò omnes isti inter se consentiunt? An singuli satis habent constitutum quid sequantur? An inter illos nullæ unquam dissensiones, nullæ lites extiterunt? Cur ergo Scotistæ et Thomistæ de merito congrui et condigni; de peccato originis in beatâ Virgine; de voto solemnî et simplici, non melius inter se conveniunt? Cur Canonistæ auricularem confessionem de jure humano, et positivo esse aiunt; scholastici contra, de jure divino? Cur Albertus Pighius a Caietano, Thomas a Lombardo, Scotus a Thoma, Occamus a Scoto, Alliensis ab Occamo, Nominales a Realibus dissensiunt?” &c. &c.—*Enchiridion Theologicum*. Oxon. 1802. p. 233.

And not less appropriately Mr. Townsend.

"Councils have been opposed to councils; and popes to popes. 'The Council of Constance took away the cup from the laity, the Council of Basle restored it. The Council of Constantinople forbade the worship of images, the second Council of Nice commanded it. The Council of Frankfort forbade the same, the Council of Trent restored it. Many writers have published Socinian opinions. The Jesuits are Arminian; the Jansenists, Calvinists. Pope Leo annulled the Acts of Adrian—Stephen, of Formosus—John, of Stephen,' &c. &c.—*Review of Declaration*, p. 32.

We will go, however, a step farther in the way of admission. If the Bishop of Rome (supposing his Church to be purified from what we now deem its idolatries, errors, and corruptions) could induce us to believe that the preservation and propagation of the Christian faith might be aided by the establishment of *one spiritual* head over the whole of Christendom, it might be our duty to entertain the question. For argument's sake, however, we will suppose, for a moment, that the proposition of one common earthly head over the *whole* Church of Christ might be entertained, simply as a project within the scope of ecclesiastical polity, (with all proper consents,) independently of any groundless claims vainly fetched from Scripture. Now, let us ask, what effect might be anticipated in practice from this proposal? Are there any objections? We answer, Yes; innumerable ones. The attempt cannot succeed. First, is there any parallel in civil polity of sufficient extent to encourage the attempt? There is not. The name and Gospel of Christ may be said generally (in the civilized world at least) to have been, and to be, "*preached to all nations.*" What earthly power is there extending so far? Next: Is there any thing like a sufficient guarantee for either the safety, or feasibility of an experiment, of the nature and extent here alluded to? There is not. Again: Could any *one* man be found (assuming, as we do, the pretence of *infallibility* to be abandoned, together with other corruptions) equal to sustain such a burden, either with credit to himself, or edification to the Church? We are persuaded that there is not. Once more: Even supposing it a possibility in *civil* matters, is there not something in the nature of *spiritual* dominion, when applied over such an extent, to make it still more hazardous? The answer must still be against the attempt. Setting aside, therefore, the unscriptural pretensions of papal supremacy, and bringing down this false claim to an infinitely lower level, the attempt at such dominion, even on the reduced ground, would be as perilous, not to Christian union only, but to Christianity itself; as the actual claim of it is disallowed by the testimony of history, and at vari-

ance with the dictates of Scripture and reason. But we return to the Romanists and Dissenters.

In opposition to these means of union, proposed by the former, and to the Pope, whom they regard as the centre of it, the following is the language of the Dissenters' Creed, scattered over the pages of their Protestant Catechism. "It becomes all honest men to bear their testimony against all impositions in matters of religion."—"The Dissenters ought to be exceedingly thankful to God for, and diligent to the utmost to *improve*, the liberty they enjoy of separating from a National Church which they think so corrupt, and of worshipping God in a manner agreeable to the dictates of their consciences."—"We ought not to submit to human impositions."—"The forefathers (of Dissenters) left the National Church, not on account of *doctrines*, but those impositions on conscience which strike at the headship of Jesus Christ."* It will be seen in a moment how opposite this extreme is to that of the Romanists. The latter boasts of popery as the centre of union, and upholds the value and importance of Christian unity. The Dissenter congratulates his brethren on his "liberty to separate from (the) National Church;" saying not a word, at the same time, of the advantage of union, nor dropping a single hint to his catechist of what an inspired Apostle, for whose writings, in common with the whole of Scripture, he claims a paramount respect, says in condemnation of religious "divisions." With the Romanist, then, unity is everything; with the Dissenter, nothing. His declaration is, "that divisions in religious sentiment and worship are of no consequence, provided universal love in *spirit* prevailed. He teaches that unity of *faith*, *discipline*, and *worship*, forms no part of the revealed scheme of Christian duty. Some of our readers would be struck with the curious way in which Dissenters are apt to treat of Christian union in their discourses to their own particular congregations. They speak as if there were no description of Christians under the sun but the particular denomination they belong to;—as if Christian unity began and ended amongst themselves. We repeat, then, that on this, as well as other points, the Romanist and the Dissenter are at opposite ends of the ladder. So important is this subject, that we could gladly extend our remarks upon the Dissenters' case as we have done already upon that of the Romanists. But, as we are sensible it would be a digression, we refer to some remarks in Mr. Merewether's book, (p. 45—101,) far too copious for insertion here, which we recommend earnestly to the calm reflection of the considerate and discerning Dissenter. The only question we have here to ask is what belongs strictly to our subject:—Can the two parties under consideration wish the

* Protestant Dissenters' Catechism, pp. 63, 71, 72, 73.

schemes of each other, respecting Christian union or its contrary, to be forwarded? Can the Romanist do otherwise than tremble at that unbridled appetite for separation, which is the vital principle of the Dissenter? Can the Dissenter admire, and covet, the extension of the Roman Catholic scheme of union throughout Christendom, on the terms which the Pope would prescribe?

Again, there is a great gulf between the Romanist and the Dissenter on the subject of the *Rule of Faith*. The language of the Romanists, as expressed in the Declaration, is as follows.

“When the reading and the circulation of the Scriptures are urged and recommended as the entire rule of faith, as the sole means by which men are to be brought to the certain and specific knowledge of the doctrines, precepts, and institutions of Christ; and when the Scriptures, so read and circulated, are left to the interpretation and private judgment of each individual; then such reading, circulation, and interpretation, are forbidden by the Catholic Church: because,” &c.—*Declaration*, p. 8.

Mr. Townsend has some valuable and judicious reflections, both on the whole of this section (3) of the “*Declaration*,” and likewise on this particular passage. With regard to which he reasonably remarks on behalf of the Church of England:—

“The reading and circulation of the Scriptures is not recommended by the Church of England, as the *sole* means, by which men are to be brought to the specific knowledge of the doctrines and institutions of Christ. It is the *principal* means: but to it we add the administration of the Sacrament, and the preaching of the word of God. We place, however, the Bible in the hands of *all* our people; because the Author of Revelation has not limited its perusal to the wise, the learned, the grave, or the prudent.”—*Review*, p. 40.

He points out too, very properly, the absurdity of the consequence, that because “Christianity was established in some countries before one book of the New Testament Scripture was written”—“therefore the private interpretation of the Bible is denied to be the means ordained by Christ for the communication of the law.”—*Review*, p. 41.

It is material to mark these fallacies while the language of the Roman Catholics is under our notice; not merely for the sake of doing justice to our own Church, but also to make it appear more clearly how distant the two extremes, now under consideration, are from each other. The Romanist, it is here seen, from language that the “British Catholics” at least admit, denies the Scriptures to be “the entire rule of faith.” The “British Catholics” enumerate a variety of evils arising out of having the Scriptures (“read and circulated as the entire rule of faith”) “left to the interpretation, and private judgment, of each individual;” and they say for themselves expressly, that, because of these evils,

“such reading, circulation, and interpretation, are forbidden by the Catholic Church.” Now, whatever may be said of this passage from the “Declaration,” it may at least be affirmed of it, what cannot be said of all other parts, that it is clear, tangible, and explicit. It admits of no mistake. It is the unequivocal, distinct voice, of “the Catholic bishops, the vicars apostolic, and their coadjutors, in Great Britain.”

Now, let us seek the opposite extreme. Let us take the Dissenters’ case. It is as follows:—In the preface to their Catechism, “the sufficiency of the Scriptures, and the right of private judgment,” are placed amongst the great principles of Nonconformity; and in the body of the Catechism itself (p. 22), “the right of private judgment—in opposition to all human authority in matters of religion—and the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as the rule of faith and practice,” are placed on the same footing. Again, it is said, in answer to another question, p. 23, “we know of no spiritual rulers who have a juster claim to implicit faith, and unlimited obedience, than civil magistrates.”

Now, whatever may be the respective merits of these two sets of opinions, (upon a middle sentiment between the two we shall say a few words presently,) it is manifest they are *opposites*; and we may safely call them *extreme opposites*. The Dissenters say the Scriptures are “a sufficient rule of faith and practice;” the Romanists say they are *not* sufficient—something more is necessary. The Dissenters claim for every Christian, high or low, rich or poor, “the right of private judgment;” the Romanists say no Christian must have any judgment on religious matters, but that of the Church; and it deserves remark, that where the “Catholic” speaks (in page 7 of the “Declaration”) of his “liberty to think so,” he means the liberty to think, as his Church thinks for him, for this is all he wants. He is to see with the Church’s eyes—to hear with the Church’s ears. These sentiments are north and south, and are deemed to be of prime importance by their respective partizans. Can we doubt, then, that there exists in each a deep-seated jealousy against any possible or probable encouragement and diffusion of the sentiments of the other? This brings us to new matter. It is the profession of an opinion which both say they hold in common:—the popular principle, “liberty of conscience.” Let us see how both state it.

The “British Catholic” says,

“The Catholic is fully persuaded, that all the articles of his faith are really revealed by Almighty God. Is he not at liberty to think so, as well as others are to think the contrary; and in this empire especially, where liberty of thought is so loudly proclaimed and lauded?”—*Declaration*, p. 6.

The Dissenter puts the same sentiment in the following shape :

“ If men have a right to think for themselves, they must have an equal right to act according to their judgment and conscience, and are in duty bound to do it. So that where persons think the established forms of religion unscriptural or defective, a regard to their own edification, and the cause of pure religion, require them to dissent.”—*Catechism*, p. 24—25.

It seems from these passages, that in the broad principle of universal toleration, the two parties, whose names stand at the top of our pages, *in words* at least, agree. Liberty of thought—liberty of conscience—liberty of action, is the phrase. They agree that all should have this freely, and without restraint ; they claim it for themselves—they maintain it in behalf of others. But if we go into detail, is it clear that these two parties, by “ liberty of conscience,” mean one and the same thing ? Rather is not their meaning directly contrary ? Does the Romanist mean to say that it is safe for every Christian to think just as he likes in religion, without listening to the voice of his Church ? Does he mean to say, that any Christian is otherwise than in danger, if he refuses to surrender his reason and judgment to the infallibility of the Church, wherever that infallibility may be defined to reside ? Take the other side—will the Dissenter, upon his own principles, be content with anything short of every individual Christian being left free in conscience, (no matter under what impulses or influences,) to make choice of his own religion ? So far from holding out to him any danger from the exercise of his individual choice in so grave a matter, (as the Romanist would,) will he not tell him plainly, that as he values his own salvation, he must “ *prove all things*” for himself, and for himself “ *hold fast that which* (he thinks) *is good* ?” It is manifest, therefore, that however the Romanist and the Dissenter may appear in words to arrive at the same conclusion—in deed and in truth their premises are so widely different, as to make it questionable whether they intend to say the same thing. It will be worth while to trace this a little farther. It will be worth while to measure the Romanist’s “ Declaration,” on this point, with other tenets of his, or rather with other parts of this very “ Declaration ;” after which, in this instance of comparison, at least between the two bodies, the advantage will turn out to be vastly in favour of the Dissenter. “ The doctrinal principle of exclusive salvation (says the ‘ British Catholic,’ through his ‘ Bishops, &c.’) belongs to the law of Christ.” We have granted this position within what we hold to be its proper limits. But what does the “ Catholic” (as he calls himself) mean by it ? Has he

not a favourite maxim deeply seated in his breast—"Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus?" and by "Ecclesiam," does not he mean what we call "Ecclesiam Romanam?" Again, when the Catholic says (Decl. p. 7,) he "is fully satisfied, that the method which he follows, for ascertaining *what* are the revealed doctrines of divine faith, is the right rule;" and, of course, that any method opposed to this must be wrong; does he mean to say, that he may call it *politically proper*, for a man to be held and hold himself at liberty to depart from this rule if he individually thinks right? No, the self-called Catholic cannot mean this. It is impossible. If so, how greatly has the Dissenter the advantage in this particular! He at least speaks consistently throughout. His creed is not here found at variance with itself. He makes it every man's business to pick out his own creed; and he no where, in any authorized formulary that we know of, has said anything at war with this maxim. And with respect to "liberty of conscience," is there a single Romanist who will say, that he would spurn temporal as well as spiritual power for his Pope, if it were to be had; especially provided the former should appear subsidiary to the latter? Has he ever spurned it when he could have it? And when the Bishop of Rome has been in possession of it, has it ever been exercised to favour "liberty of conscience?"

Having gone thus far in our investigation, we think we may safely conclude, that as far as respects religion, the parties before us cannot, with any degree of consistency or justice to their respective opinions, coalesce. Let us now see whether there is any common political ground upon which they can both stand. Both Romanist and Dissenter say, they think it hard that they should be excluded from their share in the high offices of trust and power in the State, and in corporate bodies and elsewhere. And the slightest inquiry may suffice to show, that political ability would add to, and political disability does now diminish the strength of each. Is it to be anticipated for an instant, that when the Romanist or the Dissenter is admitted into the Privy Council Chamber, or either House of Parliament, that he should leave his opinions outside the door? And if he, and all who think with him, bring their opinions along with them, can it be doubted, that in some way or other, these sentiments will show themselves, and aim at gaining strength? We are not called upon to show when or how this would be the case; that would depend upon the occasion given. It is more than sufficient for our present purpose, to advert to the simple fact, that even as the House of Commons is now constituted, the few Dissenters there do continually exhibit the operation of their peculiar and distinctive principles. Now,

if this be the case already, how will it be if the doors of the Privy Council and of Parliament are thrown open, without restriction, to the Romanist and the Dissenter? There is not a person living who knows anything of human nature, that can doubt of the strength which would be given, by removal of the present disabilities, to each of the parties before us, to be used or abused at their discretion.

We are thus brought, by an easy transition, to the question:—How far a coalition of the two parties can be considered influential on our English community at large? The chief danger which we apprehend from the Romanist arises from what is justly called his “divided allegiance.” Disclaim this to our satisfaction, and the question assumes as different a shape as light and darkness. The learned and temperate Bishop of Durham’s observations in the House of Lords ought never to be forgotten.

“Theoretically speaking, indeed, spiritual and temporal authority are distinct; but practically, in most cases, it is hardly possible to disunite them.

“If *spiritual* jurisdiction or authority, in whatever degree, be acknowledged as the right of some *other* potentate, that, whether it be more or less, is so much subtracted from the Supreme Authority, claimed, and justly claimed, by the Head of the State; and the subject who is placed in such a predicament can pay only a *divided* allegiance to his rightful sovereign; an *allegiance* which, however sincere and faithful, as far as it extends, is avowedly imperfect in this respect; and, consequently, curtails his right to the same favour and privileges—the same degree of trust and power, which others may enjoy who submit to the State without any such reservations or restrictions.”

The Bishop confirmed the apprehension to be justly derived from the character of this “divided allegiance,” by quoting the following position translated from Bellarmine, (*de Potest. Pontif. lib. v. cap. 1.*)

“The Pope, as Pope, has not directly and immediately any temporal, but only a spiritual power; nevertheless, *by reason of the spiritual, he has, at least, indirectly, a certain power, and that supreme, in temporals.*”—*Speech*, p. 14.

So that, as long as the *spiritual* dominion is claimed, as it is by the Romanist for his Pope; so long we must hold him according to the constitution of these realms, only half a British subject.

Let us now turn to interrogate the English Dissenter on this subject. Him we shall actually find in the same predicament, though, perhaps, with a difference, as far as theory goes, by no means in his favour. For the throne which he asserts that our earthly monarch has usurped, by calling himself the Head of the Church,

belongs, according to the Dissenter, to no less a person than the Divine Saviour and Redeemer of the world. Such is the Dissenter's creed. Thus he speaks—

“ Though the Dissenters think it their duty to honour and obey the King in *civil* matters, they apprehend such power as our present constitution gives him in affairs of *religion*, to be not only foreign to the province of the civil magistrate, but highly derogatory to the honours of Christ, whom God hath appointed, ‘ head over all things to the Church,’ and a gross infringement of the liberty of Christians, who in matters of faith and conscience, are forbidden to be the servants of men. (1 Cor. ii. 23.)”—*Protestant Dissenter's Catechism*, pp. 28—29.

After such a formal and authoritative declaration, can the English Protestant Nonconformist wonder at his being an object of reasonable jealousy to the Constitution of Great Britain! He must see that his is a divided, or (if he would like it better, we will say) restricted allegiance, as well as the Romanist's; because, if the Dissenter's Creed be true, our Constitutional Monarch sits in the place of one whom none who “ *love the Lord Jesus Christ*” could see displaced without concern. If, then, the Romanist be an object of jealousy on the ground of “ divided allegiance,” we have surely said enough to show, that the Dissenter is not less so.

Our opinion, therefore, as to the effect of a coalition between the two parties, whose tenets we have been considering, is too clear to be misunderstood. The coalition would furnish grounds for jealousy and apprehension. Yet, at the same time, we are not very uneasy, for we do not think such coalition will ever take place. It is only one party, the Romanists, that appear to invite it. To do so, they even place the Dissenters' supposed grievances *before* their own. We trust, however, there is even on this subject, in reality, no common ground between them; for if there be, it is ground foreign from that of the British Constitution. A noble peer (Lord Redesdale) is reported to have said in his place, in the House of Lords, a short time ago, that—

“ The House, as preservers of the Established Church, should not be deceived by the petitions of the Catholics for the Dissenters, nor of the Dissenters for the Catholics, for both had but one object in view, namely, to overthrow the Protestant Church of England.”

We would gladly stop short of this opinion, if we knew how; but provided the coalition takes place, we do not see how we can come to any other conclusion.

It is due to the Dissenters to acknowledge, (and a most important feature it is in the present case,) that they have not as yet taken any decided step towards this coalition; they have not accepted the offers held out to them. In an earlier stage of this

business, indeed, some Dissenters petitioned Parliament against what is called emancipation; and a large body of them, though certainly not friendly to this course, and avowing broadly the principles upon which Catholic emancipation is founded, have yet thought it wise to keep aloof from going farther into the case. We extract their declaration from Mr. Merewether's book.

The Committee of "The Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty," at a Meeting on Monday, entered into Resolutions, expressing—

"First, That they perceive with regret, that the presentation of about twenty-five petitions, from persons calling themselves Protestant Dissenters, had involved the thousands of congregations of Protestant Dissenters in England and Wales, in the imputation of indifference or religious hostility to those great principles of religious freedom for which their forefathers contended, and to which they continue ever attached.

"Secondly, That the Society have repeatedly declared their belief that the right to religious liberty is an universal, paramount, inalienable right; that religious opinions should not alone qualify, or disqualify, for public offices; that all restraints on their expression, by penalties or exclusions, are acts of oppression and of wrong; that the connexion of privileges and emoluments, with particular opinions, may create hypocrites or martyrs; but that the unrestricted allowance of all religious opinions and diversities of worship is essential to the rights of conscience, favourable to the promotion of piety, and propitious to the harmony and improvement of mankind.

"And, thirdly, That being convinced that the concessions proposed to be made by the depending bill will not give to the Roman Catholics, in England or Ireland, any particular advantages over Protestant Dissenters in those countries, they will not, as Protestant Dissenters, interfere in a manner that may prejudice or prejudge the bill, but will leave the measure to the wisdom and justice of Parliament."—*Case between the Church and the Dissenters*, pp. 29—30.

We agree with Mr. Merewether in thinking that this is not very "patriotic" language; it is saying in so many words, "we will take care of ourselves—let the Romanists take care of themselves. No matter what becomes of our common country." As far as the Dissenters' own "interest" is concerned, we believe it will not be found in making common cause with the Romanists, but rather with the Church of England against the Romanists. We offer this expression of our belief to them in the name of Protestantism. And so we bid them farewell.

ART. VIII.—*The Doctrine and Law of Marriage, Adultery, and Divorce; exhibiting a Theological and Practical View of the Divine Institution of Marriage; the Religious Ratification of Marriage; the Impediments which preclude and vitiate the Contract of Marriage; the reciprocal Duties of Husbands and Wives; the sinful and criminal Character of Adultery; and the Difficulties which embarrass the Principle and Practice of Divorce: with an Appendix, containing an Essay on the Hellenistic and Ecclesiastical Meaning of the Word ΠΟΡΝΕΙΑ, ordinarily translated Fornication.* By Hector Davies Morgan, M.A. of Trinity College, Oxford; Minister of Castle Heddingham, Essex. Oxford. Parker. London. Rivingtons. 1826. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 10*s.*

IF brevity be the soul of wit, the author before us is not a witty man; but he is laborious, learned, and pious; and such persons as can prevail upon themselves to encounter the tediousness of two solid octavos, will find that Mr. Morgan has studied his subject with diligence, and explained it in the more important parts with success. He has firmly established the divine institution of the marriage state, and the expedience and antiquity of a religious ratification of the marriage rite. He has pointed out many of the errors into which our English legislators have fallen, from time to time, upon this important question. He has set forth the crime of adultery in its true colours, and has examined, at great length, into the subject of divorce, especially under the English law. But this is not all: Mr. Morgan further strives to prove that no marriages were ever held valid in this country unless they were celebrated by a priest; and not satisfied with pointing out the inconsistencies of our law and practice of divorce, he contends, in defiance of our Saviour's declaration, that divorce for adultery is not permitted in Scripture.

We are sorry that such erroneous positions should have been admitted into the work. As a book of authority, they are fatal to its claim. They weaken the cause which the author wishes to support. They tend to prolong disputes respecting minor questions, and to leave the public in doubt upon the great points at issue. In spite of their faults, however, there is much in these volumes which demands the attention of every one who desires to understand the existing controversies concerning marriage, and the circumstances of the times will justify our devoting some space to a full consideration of their contents.

The wise and good of all parties are agreed in admitting that marriage is of the greatest importance to human hap-

piness, public morals, and national strength; and that a due regulation and observance of its rites are necessary to the progressive improvement of our species. The difference between the community of wives in Aboriginal Britain and the wedded love of modern times, is a proof that from one cause or other mankind may be induced to alter its practice concerning marriage. From the North American squaw, or the Otaheite prostitute, to the virtuous wife and daughter of the European peasant, the change is sufficient to warrant sanguine expectations of ultimate and universal amendment. There is enough in these and other well-known facts to shame and silence such as deny its possibility and deride its promoters; and the only doubt which should be tolerated in the business relates not to the propriety or advantages of regulating the intercourse between the sexes, but to the sources from which such regulations originally sprang, and to the principle upon which they ought to be conducted.

The Christian opens his Bible, and is convinced that he must either admit the divine and primitive institution of marriage, or deny the authority of that sacred record. The philosopher turns over the page of history, and maintains that polygamy, if not promiscuous concubinage, was universally practised in ancient times; and that civilization and laws have gradually introduced the rite of marriage, and placed it upon the footing which it now holds in the world. In opposition to this theory—a theory assumed by all who reject religion, and imprudently admitted by some who are ranked among its friends, it ought to be remembered, that traces of one wife may be found in the history, the laws, or the customs of every ancient nation. Whichever way we turn, whether to China, where civilization has reached so high a pitch, or to New South Wales, where men approach nearest to brutes, the most inveterate polygamy is not free from marks of an older and purer system. In China, whose claims to a remote antiquity are ostentatiously advanced by sceptics—where polygamy has existed for a long course of years, the right of inheritance is limited exclusively to children of the first wife,—a circumstance not easily to be explained, except upon the supposition that at some remote period the men took no more wives than one. In Hindostan, where philosophers have discovered positive proof of the dependence of marriage upon climate, we are now informed that polygamy is an abuse and violation of the law, permitted to the great because they are above restraint, but at variance with the genuine and ancient customs of the Hindoos. The aboriginal inhabitants of New South Wales rear the children of the first wife only, and expose or destroy the fruit of all their other marriages. In the absence of any countervailing circumstances, these facts have at

least a strong resemblance to the Scripture history of mankind. And if the marriage of one man to one woman was a primitive institution, then can there be little or no reason to doubt, independently of the authority of the Bible, that it was a divine institution likewise. However natural or expedient that union, man, left to himself, would never have adopted so wise, so pure, so equitable a practice. Polygamy was his contrivance. In spite of justice, reason, and nature, in spite too, as we are supposing, of primitive custom, man introduced into every quarter of the world that plurality of wives which existed, with more or less enormity, in every country under heaven, and consequently the marriage of one man to one woman must have originated with God. Scripture distinctly asserts the fact. It is not at variance with history: Reason exercising herself upon the materials which history collects, is capable of answering the objections which may be urged, and of corroborating the various proofs; and the Christian who consents to speak and think of marriage, upon any other hypothesis than that of its divine institution, takes a false step which may lead him irrecoverably astray.

But this is not all. The primitive and divine institution of marriage is the first link in the chain; the second, not in importance, but in time, is that the marriage system of the Christian world has originated altogether in Christianity. In contending against the original existence of a plurality of wives, we have not questioned its subsequent extension throughout every quarter of the globe. The restrictions upon it may have been more or less strict; the attendant circumstances more or less revolting; the mitigation more or less effectual; but the practice, in some shape or other, was universal. We do not mean to say, that, before the preaching of the Gospel, it was lawful for every person, in every country, to have more wives than one. But the prevailing law of Christendom respecting marriage, namely, that it be between two persons only, that it be equally obligatory upon every class, that it communicates equal rights to the man and the woman, that it admit of no divorce, except for adultery; nor then, except by the judgment of a court of law; and that the crime of adultery be equally punishable in both parties: this law is the fruit of the Gospel, and is not the least among the blessings which the Gospel has communicated to mankind.

Those who dissent from the foregoing opinion must either show that marriage, as now practised among us, existed before the preaching of Christianity, or they must trace the alteration which has taken place to some other source. In the first instance, they will be required to explain away not only the gross polygamy

which prevailed in the East, but the divorce law of ancient Rome. Such divorces made the nuptial bond a nullity. Among the savage tribes of Europe, Tacitus assures us that polygamy was general; and even the Germans, whose morals he so highly extols, permitted their chiefs to possess more wives than one. But the other alternative will be more commonly chosen by such as are unwilling to admit the claims of the Gospel, and they will either pretend, with Montesquieu, that climate is the great lawgiver, or, with Lord Kaimes, that civilization has raised the female to her proper level, and purified the matrimonial customs of Europe. These are the two principal theories by which our view of the question is opposed. And the writers we have named hold a distinguished rank among the ablest, and most upright of their advocates. And to what do their respective pleadings amount? The conduct of Montesquieu, on the subject of marriage, is unworthy of his character. He argues against polygamy, and affects to speak of the Christian marriage system with respect; yet he endeavours indirectly to connect a plurality of wives with warmth of climate, and one wife with the contrary; and he attributes the easy reception of Christianity in Europe, and its non-reception in Asia and Africa to these circumstances: he explains the opposite fate of Mahometanism upon the same principles; and throughout the whole of his observations on the subject insinuates much more than he ventures to assert. The laboured defence of his opinions on this subject, which accompanied the second edition of his great work, is rather a repetition of previous sophistry, than a candid admission that marriage owes much to Christianity, or a bold denial of the fact. All this artifice, however, avails the writer nothing. He passes over the important alterations respecting divorce, which have uniformly accompanied the progress of true religion: he even seems to approve of the practice of Heathen Rome; and he is unable to substantiate his theory by facts. Polygamy is not confined to the warm latitudes: it exists, or did exist, in Kamschatka, and in the neighbourhood of Hudson's Bay: it existed in Northern Europe before the preaching of Christianity: it exists in the cold and temperate parts of China: and Montesquieu's explanation of a fact which was most perplexing to him as a sceptic, reflects no particular credit upon his fairness or talents as a system-builder. Lord Kaimes has more to say for himself: he contends, with his usual acuteness, for the natural fitness of marriage as it is now established; and even assigns some little credit to Christianity for its share in accomplishing a great work which the nations to whom it was preached, were already disposed to sanction. But civilization and knowledge are his great instruments; and, doubt-

less, they appeared to him sufficient for their task. Others may be allowed to ask, if an event which took place in the dark ages can be reasonably attributed to the light of knowledge? if an institution which gradually fixed itself on Europe between the seventh and the eleventh centuries, is really the effect of polished manners and refined understandings? The thing is impossible. Ancient history is directly opposed to it. In Asia the most civilized people have always been most abhorrent of marriage, as established among us. In Greece and Rome marriage became less sacred as luxury and arts increased. And he is a bold man who will contend, in spite of universal experience, that the most outrageous polygamists of the present time, be they Chinese, or Hindoos, or Africans, will ever adopt a purer marriage code from civilization only; or that they would hesitate to do so at once, if they were induced to embrace Christianity.

To this we may add, the very remarkable fact that most men who have set themselves to decry religion in Europe, have contended, in one way or other, for a relaxation of Christian marriage. In our own country, and our own times, a writer who is now universally despised, but who had formerly his admiring readers, undertook to liberalize the public mind upon this subject. In France, as soon as the revolutionary tribunals had publicly abolished Christianity, they proceeded, with admirable consistency, to establish an unlimited system of divorce. Wherever Christianity has been overturned, and Mahometanism established in its stead, the relapse to polygamy has been simultaneous with the revolt from religion; and neither climate, nor civilization, nor custom, have availed to protect marriage from an overthrow. To the conviction, therefore, which a believer in the Bible must always feel respecting the divine institution of marriage, we are bound to add that Christianity has furnished Europe with its existing marriage law. In truth, it has furnished much more; for customs, and opinions, and feelings are above law; and these as they now exist in our hearts, and before our eyes, are derived from the Gospel and from no other source. Whether the proof of this momentous fact has been sufficiently indicated (for we presume not to suppose that it has been duly developed and established) in these brief observations, is a different question. But the fact itself is certain: those who think proper to deny it, may deny anything else they please; and those who believe it and overlook it, are the weakest or most inconsistent of men.

Nor is it safe to contend, as is done by Mr. Morgan, and other writers, that there is any third circumstance connected with marriage equally important, or equally certain with these funda-

mental facts, or necessarily connected with them. The religious ceremony, however sacred, expedient, and indispensable, ought not to be confounded with the divine institution, or the Christian confirmation of marriage.

Mr. Morgan appears to us to have fallen into no trifling error upon this part of the subject. He commences with a long and careful examination of the marriage ceremonies of ancient nations, and the declarations and testimony of Christian writers for the first 1200 years; and the result of his inquiries is communicated in the following passage:—

“ In the view which has been taken of the practice of the Church for the first twelve centuries, it would be vain to pretend, that all the several testimonies are equally clear and distinct; but taken together, and explained in dependence upon each other, they form a strong and conclusive argument. They leave no period for the introduction of religious rites, no period in which the religious ratification of marriage was unknown. The Jewish rites were retained by the Jews; and the heathen rites, purified from what was properly heathen, or celebrated for a civil purpose, in compliance with the existing law, were adopted by the converts from heathenism, eventually obtained the sanction of Constantine, and in the use of the ring and the bridecake, have not yet been superseded. The writers of the first ages were too usefully occupied to dwell upon circumstances, which were familiar to their contemporaries, but of which it is difficult, in the present day, to form a just conception. There was then a distinction between the espousals and the marriage, which no more prevails; and the benediction of the espousals became, in process of time, equivalent to the ratification of marriage, to the offices of which, in the primitive liturgies, it gave the name and title. The opinions of many of the early fathers were too friendly to monastic life to allow them to expatiate upon the ratification of marriage, the solemnities of which were often precluded by the disputed lawfulness of second marriages. For a certain period the empire was heathen, and the validity of marriage depended on the imperial law, not on religious rites or ecclesiastical canons. Of the marriage of the heathen the Church could take no cognizance; the marriages of the believing with the unbelieving it could not sanction, and it could not dissolve: and in many parts the Church itself was so imperfectly settled, that the ratification of marriage, as in the remote colonies of the present day, was obviously, and from the necessity of the case, impracticable. Notwithstanding these difficulties, there is a body of traditional evidence, which, taken together, leaves no doubt that marriage was usually, if not universally celebrated with religious rites; which proves the general practice, if it fails of establishing the absolute necessity, of the sacerdotal benediction.”

—vol. i. p. 125—126.

This appears a fair account of the evidence produced by Mr. Morgan, and we conceive that on this ground alone he might contend most triumphantly for the propriety of preserving the

religious celebration of marriage. But in the following chapter "On the religious ratification of Marriage in England," he carries his views much further, maintains, in opposition to Blackstone, that marriage by a priest is not *juris positivi*, but *juris naturalis*, or *juris divini*, and proceeds in a long and most unsatisfactory argument to prove that previously to the passing of the Marriage Act, no marriage could be valid without a religious ceremony. We have no desire to set up our own opinion in opposition to Mr. Morgan's, for we are firmly persuaded that our opinion in matters of law is of nearly the same value as his. But we must protest against his mode of proceeding in this business. In the course of a learned, laborious work, full of authorities, evidence and criticism, the writer falls in with a question of English law, which was *formerly* a matter of difficulty and doubt. And how does he treat it? His extracts and references are principally from the newspapers; his argument consists of the speech of one of the counsel in the case of *Beer v. Ward*; and the opinions of judges, or the decisions of courts, are not deemed worthy of notice. The result, as might have been anticipated, is this: Mr. Morgan's law is directly opposed to the law of Lord Stowell, the greatest authority upon this question, to the law of Lord Eldon, Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Tenterden, and, unless we are very much mistaken, of every other magistrate on the bench. In the last debate on the Dissenters' Marriage Bill, the present Lord Chancellor expressly cited the decision of Lord Stowell in *Dalrymple v. Dalrymple*, and it was admitted on all hands that before the passing of Lord Hardwicke's Act, a contract *per verba de præsenti*, constituted a valid marriage in this country. We do not feel ourselves called upon to enter into a discussion upon the question, which has thus been completely set at rest; and set at rest upon grounds which, as far as the unlearned can presume to judge, appear sufficient and convincing. But we warn our clerical brethren against following the example of Mr. Morgan on this subject. It can only serve to expose their lucubrations to contempt. The valuable portion of a work will not be valued or read, if it is mixed up with such worthless chaff. We speak strongly, but not unadvisedly. Mr. Morgan's is an aggravated offence: for in a preceding page he favours us with his opinion respecting Jewish marriages in this country, and quotes from the newspapers certain proceedings with regard to them which took place before the Lord Mayor. Did Mr. Morgan never read or hear of Lord Stowell's celebrated judgment, respecting Jewish marriages, in the case of *Lindo v. Belisario*?—if not, we venture to recommend a perusal of it. It will remove his apprehensions respecting the uncertainty of Jewish marriages, and unless we are

much mistaken, he will rise from the task we have taken the liberty to impose with a conviction that the chief magistrate of the city of London, for the time being, is not quite so good a judge of ecclesiastical affairs as Lord Stowell. In truth, nothing can be more absurd than to treat the judgment of that venerable person with disrespect. The wisdom and learning which are perspicuous throughout his decisions, the beautiful language in which they are communicated, and the sound discretion which pervades every part of them, demand the admiration even of persons who think themselves wronged by the result. But the cause of religion is not wronged by Lord Stowell's decisions. Though he has not adopted Mr. Morgan's opinion on a complicated legal question, yet has he spoken again and again in terms which clearly explain the great difficulty respecting the marriage contract; and we recommend his observations to the special notice of every one who wishes to understand this long-litigated question.

"Marriage being a contract, is of course *consensual*; for it is the essence of all contracts to be contracted by the consent of parties." "Marriage in its origin is a contract of natural law; it may exist between two individuals of different sexes, although no third person existed in the world, as happened in the case of the common ancestors of mankind. It is the parent, not the child, of civilized society. *Principium urbis et quasi seminarium Reipublicæ*. In civil society it becomes a civil contract, regulated and prescribed by law, and endowed with civil consequences. In most civilized countries acting under a sense of the force of sacred obligations, it has had the sanctions of religion superadded. It then becomes a religious as well as a natural and civil contract; for it is a great mistake to suppose that because it is the one, therefore it may not likewise be the other. Heaven itself is made a party to the contract, and the consent of individuals pledged to each other, is ratified and consecrated by a vow to God."*

This is a clear and unexceptionable statement. It does away the common-place argument against a religious celebration of marriage, by showing that although marriage be a civil contract, it is at the same time something more. The terms "civil contract," so grossly abused by declaimers on this subject, have become a terrible bugbear in the ears of some churchmen. No sooner do they hear the words pronounced, than they give up their cause for lost, or appeal to a more equitable, or better informed tribunal. The Dissenter, on the other hand, is as much delighted as the Churchman is appalled; and the phrase "civil contract" is repeated with the pertinacity of a starling, till the world consents to believe that there is some potent spell in the sound. But what says Lord Stowell? That the phrase, with respect to the matter now in dispute, has no meaning or import-

* Haggard's Consistory Reports, vol. i. p. 62.

ance; that marriage, in its very essence, is a contract; that originally it was a natural contract; that in civil society, being regulated by law and endowed with civil consequences, it is also a civil contract; and that in most civilized countries, especially in England, it has had the sanction of religion superadded, and has become a religious contract likewise. There is nothing here to justify the exultation of Mr. William Smith; and if the Dissenters will quote Lord Stowell fairly, they are heartily welcome to any support which they can derive from his decisions. But they never do quote him fairly. They have repeatedly told Parliament that they had his Lordship's high authority for pronouncing marriage a civil contract only: and Parliament, in its simplicity, has believed the assertion; the fact being that Lord Stowell asserts directly the contrary, and that according to his sound and temperate explanation of the law and history of the matter, it would be a grievous innovation to disjoin marriage from religion. The declaration already cited from the case of *Dalrymple v. Dalrymple*, is repeated in substance in the case of *Lindo v. Belisario*; and we have noticed another declaration in the case of *Proctor v. Proctor*, which makes Lord Stowell's opinion still more indisputable.

"There can be no question that the legal nature of the marriage contract in this country had its entire root in the ancient Canon Law of Europe: not indeed since the Reformation to the full extent of that law, which considered it as an absolute sacrament, but to the extent of considering it in each case as an act highly spiritual, consecrated by divine authority, and as such, indissoluble by human power for any cause whatever."*

We know not whether this will satisfy Mr. Morgan, but to us it appears an accurate statement of the case. Could it be shown that the intervention of a priest was indispensable to the celebration of valid marriage, it would have been Lord Stowell's duty to prove and insist upon the fact. But he has proved the reverse, and we cannot perceive the expediency of standing out in defence of an exploded error, wasting our strength in an untenable position, and being forced to retreat at last, discomfited, if not disgraced, to some securer post. The circumstances of our marriage law being derived wholly from the canons, and of heaven itself being made a party to the contract, are sufficient to establish the right of the Church to a hearing before any material alteration is adopted. Beyond this we do not believe that the argument can be maintained with success.

If any doubt should remain upon the minds of our readers respecting the inaccuracy of Mr. Morgan's notions, let them

* Haggard's Reports, vol. ii. p. 297.

consider the history of this controversy in the Roman Catholic Church. Mr. Morgan contends for the absolute necessity of the ministration of a priest to the celebration of valid marriage, and he treats the opposite opinion with something like contempt. His misapprehension of the ancient law of his own country has been already pointed out: and though he has omitted to notice, yet he has evidently misunderstood the rule and practice of the unreformed portion of the Christian Church before the decisions of the Council of Trent. When maintaining the strict necessity for a religious celebration of marriage, he must of course have been ignorant that no such necessity existed formerly in that portion of the Church which owned the authority of the Pope of Rome. The word "sacrament," applied by the Romanist to marriage, has perplexed and misled the Protestant, almost as much as the Popish world. Mr. Morgan is not the only person who has taken a part in the present controversy without seeing to the bottom of this mystery. What say the Schoolmen? What says the Council of Trent, respecting the necessary intervention of a priest in the celebration of the sacrament of marriage? In the *Summa Theologiæ* of Thomas Aquinas, it is expressly asserted that, "*Verba quibus consensus matrimonialis exprimitur, sunt forma hujus sacramenti, non autem benedictio sacerdotalis—quæ est quoddam sacramentale:*" and to prove that clandestine marriage, without consent of parents or the benediction of a priest, is valid, it is argued thus—"Ubique est debita materia, et debita forma sacramenti, ibi est sacramentum—sed in occulto matrimonio servatur debita materia, quia ibi sunt verba de præsentì consensum exprimentia, ergo est ibi verum matrimonium." And in strict accordance with this opinion are the arguments of the most influential speakers at Trent, and the final decrees of the Council. "*Il s'agissoit de sçavoir,*" (says the Continuator of Fleury's History, vol. xxxiii. p. 254,) "*si tout mariage entre les Chrétiens est un sacrement, ce qui étoit l'avis de presque tous.*" And the decrees were framed with great skill, so as to admit this point, and yet pronounce clandestine marriages invalid. Pere Lainez, the General of the Jesuits, proved that such marriages had never been declared void; and many a day was spent in considering how a new impediment (no impediment whatsoever having existed before,) could be invented for the prevention of these marriages:—and they hit at last on this notable device. They resolved that the marriages were valid, yet that the Church had always detested them; and that as great and increasing mischiefs arose from their celebration, the Church would prevent its recurrence, by decreeing that all persons who attempted to marry without the presence of the curate

or his lawful representative, with two or three witnesses, should be *incapable* of contracting lawful marriage, and that consequently any marriage they might contract would be null. The absurdity of this decree is most striking in the original Latin:—

“Tametsi, dubitandum non est clandestina matrimonia libero contrahentium consensu facta, rata et vera esse matrimonia, quamdiu Ecclesia ea irrita non fecit: et proinde jure damnandi sunt illi, ut eos Sancta Synodus anathemati damnat, qui ea vera ac rata esse negant . . . nihilominus Sancta Dei Ecclesia ex justissimis causis illa semper detestata est atque prohibuit.”

Thus the marriages are good, and they who deny it are justly anathematized; yet the Church detests and prohibits these good marriages. The evasion by which these opinions are so far reconciled as to admit of annulling clandestine marriage without denying that such marriage is a sacrament and therefore good, is expressed in the following terms:—

“Qui aliter quam præsentè Parocho vel alio Sacerdote, de ipsius Parocho, seu ordinarii licentiâ, et duobus vel tribus testibus matrimonium contrahere attentabunt, eos sancta Synodus ad sic contrahendum omnino *inhabiles* reddit—et hujusmodi contractus irritos et nullos esse decernit, prout eos præsentì decreto irritos facit, et annullat.”

Such then were the steps by which the presence of a priest was made indispensable, in the Church of Rome, to the validity of a marriage contract. Law, practice, and theology, were opposed to the new rule. But the Council of Trent decreed that the church had a right to declare *impediments*, that impediments so decreed were of power to make any marriage null, and that the attempt to contract clandestine marriage constituted such an impediment and so disqualified the parties from marrying, and rendered any contract they might enter into void. A more contemptible quibble is not to be found in the annals of Jesuitism. We have exposed it, not merely for the purpose of satisfying Mr. Morgan that the ancient law of Christendom was other than he supposes, but also on account of its bearing upon a question which we shall be required to discuss hereafter. We must first, however, advert to some other points upon which we have the misfortune to differ from that gentleman, namely, his sentiments respecting divorce for adultery.

The propriety of some change in our laws respecting offences against the seventh commandment will hardly be disputed. We cordially concur with Mr. Morgan in condemning the whole practice which now prevails, and the summary of his argument contained in the conclusion to his work appears decisive of the whole question.

“The doctrine that marriage is not merely a civil contract, but a divine

institution, establishes the sinful character of adultery, which is proved in the prohibitions and the penalties delivered in the Scriptures to be a sin of a very aggravated kind, a sin only less heinous than murder and idolatry. In its practical effects it includes a complication of the basest fraud and perjury, and inflicts an injury upon the woman, the husband, and the children, which cannot be repaired, which cannot be compromised, and which no man who consults his own heart does not deprecate as the worst of sorrow and the worst of shame. The Christian religion appreciates the equal guilt of both parties; it offers no palliation of the offence of either, and pronounces on both the sentence of eternal doom. By the Jewish law the offence was capitally punished in both parties, and the law of the bitter waters afforded a redress in cases of secret guilt, which could not be obtained by marital infidelity. The criminal character and penal consequence of adultery are approved by the common sense of mankind, and there are but few nations in which it is not punished as a crime. In the earlier stages of the English law, and at the time of the Reformation, its criminal character was also recognized, and the offence was made, or proposed to be made, liable to penal prosecution. With the only exception of a certain justification of homicide committed in retribution of adultery, and of the aggravation of the offence in a clergyman, adultery, in correspondence with the received view of marriage as a civil contract, is made a matter of civil injury, which may be satisfied by an action for trespass, and by the recovery of damages, of which the amount is estimated upon various considerations of the conduct and of the circumstances of the parties. The partiality and inadequacy of this state of the law are too plain to be denied, and various measures have been proposed for restoring it to a more just and equal operation, for recognizing the criminal character of the act, and rendering it liable to a public prosecution and to an appropriate severity of punishment."—vol. ii. pp. 386, 387.

We are sanguine enough to hope that the time is not far distant when the suggestion contained in the foregoing passage will be adopted. The ecclesiastical courts can hardly expect a long reprieve from that sentence which has gone forth against expensive, dilatory and incomplete justice. But the proceedings against adultery are not dependent merely upon the constitution of those courts; the provisions of the law are chiefly in fault, and a new code is loudly demanded by the notorious inefficiency, the grinding hardships, the false and mischievous lenity, and the liability to gross perversion and abuse which deform the present system. What crime is so absurdly, so tortuously dealt with as the violation of the marriage vow? If we go to the ecclesiastical courts they are only open to the rich; a strenuous defence can throw obstacles in the way of any prosecution, and when righteous judgment is at last pronounced, it condemns an innocent party to a divorce *a mensâ et thoro*, leaving the marriage bond in full force, and sentencing a person who has done no wrong, to a bitter

punishment for life. If we go to the civil courts and ask a recompense in money for wrongs which no money can compensate, the door is thrown open to the imputation of meanness on the one hand in seeking for damages, and to total impunity on the other hand, if the damages can be paid without inconvenience; and what is worse and more common than either of these inconveniences, there will always be a risk of collusion between the parties. If we go to the bar of the House of Lords with the verdict of a jury in one hand, and Sir John Nicholl's sentence of divorce in the other, we are there provided with a partial, expensive private remedy for a gross public wrong; and the legislature palliates the scandalous injustice of the laws, by declaring that in this particular instance they shall be of no effect.

Two things, therefore, are imperiously demanded by the state of the marriage law, a proper and adequate visitation for adultery, and a well-regulated rule of divorce. The civil action, both in cases of adultery and of seduction, ought to be abolished. If the injured parties really suffer in their purses, which may sometimes be the case, it is an injury for which they cannot be compensated without the risk of graver inconvenience. A criminal infliction ought to be denounced against the adulterer, and an indictment before a judge and jury, with imprisonment for a time certain, and with a fine varying according to the circumstances of the case, would be the simplest and safest mode of dealing with him. Both the criminal parties should be proceeded against, and their conviction be indispensable to the obtainment of a divorce. But the mention of divorce reminds us of Mr. Morgan, whose sentiments on this subject are contained in the following passage.

“ The terms of the divine institution assert the indissoluble unity of marriage, of which the perpetuity is established upon reasons worthy of the divine wisdom and benevolence, in making the most effectual provisions for the protection of the infirmity of the woman, for the continuance of the necessary solace through the whole period of human infirmity, and for the religious education of the offspring. This essential individuality of marriage is not destroyed even by the act of adultery, of which divorce is neither the proper penalty nor the necessary consequence, and which, however common in the practice of men, was not in the beginning, is an acknowledged deviation from the law of marriage, and originated in circumstances of remote and impenetrable obscurity. The first authentic law of divorce is a law remedial and restrictive of a prevailing abuse; a reluctant concession to the hardness of the Jewish heart; a permission granted without any approbation for the prevention of greater evils. The fluctuating and uncertain rules which betray the human origin of divorce are especially manifest in the laws of Greece; and however introduced into those of Rome, it was not for a long period

adopted into practice, and in the profligacy of the declining empire its facility and extension were made to demonstrate, by the most perfect experiment, that 'the liberty of divorce does not contribute to happiness and virtue.' Under any interpretation the Christian scheme restricts the licence of divorce to one single cause, throwing all the blame of the consequences upon the man who divorces his wife for any other cause; authorizing the practice only by vitiating the effects; requiring clear proof of the adultery, if that be the meaning of the clause of exception; insisting upon the innocence of the accuser, and permitting the man only to marry after the divorce without incurring the guilt of adultery. There are however difficulties in the ordinary interpretation which it is hardly possible to overcome; and it has been argued upon primitive authorities, that adultery is not meant in the clause of exception; that it is not necessary to understand that clause in the texts in which it is not expressly inserted, or to limit by the interpolation the general indissolubility of marriage; and that it is more agreeable to the Hellenistic and primitive use of the word; to the occasion, scope, and context of our Lord's discourse with the pharisees; to the other texts which contain the rule without the exception; and to the doctrine of Saint Paul, and his reference to the authority of our Lord; to understand the permissive principle of separation, particularly of the prohibited marriage with aliens, and generally not of a fault subsequent to the marriage, but of an impediment precluding the marriage, and to allow the dissolution of no contract which is not originally invalid. In tracing the Christian doctrine of divorce through several periods, it appears, that before the time of Constantine alien marriages were prohibited and null; the general indissolubility of marriage was maintained; the clause of exception was applied with the most scrupulous moderation, and was gradually perplexed by inadequate versions: and that if the separation of the parties was allowed, they were required to remain in singleness and a condition for reunion; and that adultery was held to be the consequence of marriage after separation, or, in the judgment of the monogamists, of any marriage succeeding the first. In the second period the prohibition of divorce was relaxed under the authority of the emperors and the accommodating compliances of the Church, which nevertheless did not abandon the indissolubility of marriage; and even in the third period that doctrine was retained in the Latin Church. The causes of divorce, which had been originally multiplied by the emperors, were eventually made to comprehend offences which had not the faintest or remotest reference to matrimonial sin, and which no human ingenuity can deduce from the clause of exception.

"The indissolubility of marriage is and ever has been a main principle of the English law, which permits the separation of the parties only for cruelty and adultery, and places the latter cause under various restrictions. The troubled period of the Reformation offers an equivocal argument and example of a more relaxed rule, which was not however brought into full operation before the reign of Charles II. when Parliament first assumed the right of dissolving marriage, and created the bad precedent, which, with the dangerous facility of all laws of divorce, has been carried

beyond the original intention, and under which the general law of the country is suspended in favour of individuals, and a practice is introduced, embarrassed with inextricable difficulties, marked by the grossest contradictions and anomalies in its rules and principles, and liable to all the objections of private, partial, and *ex-post-facto* law."—vol. ii. p.387—390.

We cannot follow our author through the long and able reasoning of which the passage just quoted is the result; and our inability so to do is peculiarly regretted because we regard it as the best and most interesting portion of his work; and one on which his ingenuity and learning have been most successfully lavished. But for the conduct and understanding of the marriage question, can it be necessary, at this time of day, to unravel and answer an intricate argument which concludes by denying that there is Scriptural authority for divorce on account of adultery? As an able and elaborate disquisition Mr. Morgan's work is entitled to great respect: but as long as Matt. v. 31, 32. and xix. 9. are to be found in our Bibles, we imagine that he will make few converts to his opinion. The words of our Saviour in the Sermon on the Mount—"Whoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery"—are distinct, and they are distinctly repeated on another occasion in answer to a question of the Pharisees. And it is a singular fact in the history of paradox, that from these plain words Milton persuaded himself he could prove that divorce was allowed for many other causes besides adultery, and Mr. Morgan contends that even on that account it is not permitted. Milton's argument is, that our Lord did not intend to repeal the law of Moses respecting divorce, but to expose the abuse of that law, which had crept into the Jewish system; and he understands the words of Scripture to mean, whosoever shall put away his wife, as some of you do, for an accidental and temporary cause, except that cause be fornication, &c. Mr. Morgan, if we are not mistaken, rests principally upon the notion that *πορνεια* in the passages before us does not signify adultery or fornication, but idolatry; that St. Mark and St. Luke, who do not record the saving clause respecting fornication, are, in some sense or other, to govern and limit St. Matthew, who records it twice; and upon the sayings and practices of some early Christian writers, whom we venture to pronounce of less authority in the matter of marriage than on almost any other subject that could be named.

It appears to us, however, that the utmost effect of his reasoning is not to clear up the difficulty, but to shift it from one place to another. If *πορνεια* does not mean fornication nor adultery, our Saviour did not authorize divorce on account of those crimes. But the word must have some meaning. For *πορνεια*, let it mean

what it may, our Lord did not forbid divorce; and, consequently, to say that marriage once solemnized is indissoluble, and all divorce forbidden, is absurd.

The strongest circumstance in favour of Mr. Morgan's opinion, is the fact that divorce is not permitted by the law of this country. He appears, therefore, to have high authority on his side; and if he had merely stood on the defensive, it might have been thought that it was not incumbent on him to establish the indissolubility of marriage, but rather upon those who differ from him to disprove it. But even if he had adopted this cautious mode of proceeding, we cannot bring ourselves to believe that it would have materially affected the result of our inquiry. "It is notorious," to use the words of Lord Stowell, "that this country at the Reformation adopted almost the whole of the law of matrimony, together with all its doctrines of indissolubility, of contracts *per verba de presenti, et per verba de futuro*, of separations *a mensâ et thoro*, and many others, the whole of our matrimonial law is, in matter and form, constructed upon it; some canons of our own may have varied it, and a higher authority, that of the legislature, has swept away some important parts of it; but the doctrine of indissolubility remains in full force."* The real authority therefore for the law in question is the Canon Law of the Roman Catholic Church; and unless that law is founded on Scripture and reason, and was therefore wisely retained by the Church of England at the Reformation, the circumstance of its being still in existence has no great weight.

Mr. Morgan will hardly, we presume, contend for the scriptural nature of the Canon Law. Even concerning divorce, its doctrines are most unscriptural; and whether they were derived from the early controversies respecting bigamy and digamy, or from the disposition of the Church to run into the practices of Monks, or from a laudable dread of the unrestricted and unchristian right of divorce which prevailed in the Heathen world, upon any of these suppositions, or upon any other supposition that can be entertained, the distinction between divorce *a vinculo*, and divorce *â mensâ et thoro*, is purely a human invention. The schoolmen when pressed with the texts in Matt. v. and xix. evaded them by saying, that they referred to the latter species of separation—to putting-away, *dimissionem uxoris*, not to divorce. Mr. Morgan would not condescend to avail himself of such a quibble; and consequently, whether marriage be or be not indissoluble, the Canon Law which pronounces its indissolubility is not founded on Scripture. Nor is the voice of antiquity in its favour.

* Haggard, vol. ii. p. 300.

At the Council of Trent, the Venetian ambassadors objected to the canons which were about to be adopted respecting divorce, and urged that the subjects of their republic in Cyprus, and other islands, were Grecians, and had, from all antiquity, used to put away their wives for fornication, and take others; for which rite, well known to the whole Church, they were never condemned nor reprehended by any council. And so forcible was this objection found to be, that it was resolved to make an alteration in the proposed canon; and instead of pronouncing an anathema against those who say that matrimony may be dissolved for adultery and another contracted, ("as St. Ambrose and some Greek Fathers did say, and as the Eastern Church doth practise,") to pronounce an anathema against those who say that the Church errs in teaching the contrary doctrine.*

This important circumstance is passed over without notice by Mr. Morgan: and yet it has the most intimate connection with his subject, and leaves the question in a very different state from that in which he flatters himself that he has placed it. The indissolubility of marriage is not the doctrine of Christendom, but of Rome. The Greek Church never received it. The Reformed Churches on the Continent rejected it. The Church of England, in her best days, denounced it, and prepared to rid herself of it; and has suffered innumerable inconveniencies from being still clogged with such a burden. Cranmer's celebrated code, the *Reformatio Legum*, which, in an evil hour, was abandoned by the Church, and the Canon Law of Rome installed in its place, recognizes the right of an innocent husband or wife to be released from an adulterous partner. It renounces divorces *a mensâ et thoro*. "*Mensæ Societas et Thori solebat in certis criminibus adimi conjugibus, salvo tamen inter illos reliquo matrimonij jure. Quæ constitutio cum a sacris Litteris aliena sit, et maximam perversitatem habeat, et malorum sentinam in matrimonium comportaverit, illud autoritate nostrâ totum aboleri placet.*" And this doctrine was received in the early part of the reign of Elizabeth: but, at a later date, the canons were appealed to as authority by Whitgift, and Bancroft as the *Sacræ Litteræ* had been appealed to by Cranmer; and it was held in the Star Chamber, with the advice of divines, that adultery was only a cause of divorce *a mensâ et thoro*.†

We are no advocates for unrestricted or unnecessary divorce. Lord Stowell, with his usual wisdom, eloquence, and wit, says, that "when people understand that they *must* live together, except for a very few reasons known to the law, they learn to soften,

* History of the Council of Trent, p. 705.

† See Gibson's Codex, vol. i. p. 446, and Tyrwhitt's Burn, vol. i. p. 503.

by mutual accommodation, that yoke which they know they cannot shake off; they become good husbands and good wives from the necessity of remaining husbands and wives; for necessity is a powerful master in teaching the duties which it imposes. . . . And if it be complained that by this inactivity of the courts much injustice may be suffered, and much misery produced, the answer is, that courts of justice do not pretend to furnish cures for all the miseries of human life. If people will quarrel about such matters, which they certainly may do in many cases with a great deal of acrimony, and sometimes with much reason, they yet must decide such matters as well as they can in their own domestic forum." This is the real distinction between scriptural and unscriptural divorce; and whenever the marriage law of this country is reformed, it is to be hoped that the doctrines of the Church of Rome will be rejected in theory, as they already are in practice, and that divorce, by reason of adultery, will be allowed, without compelling the parties to apply to Parliament for a separate enactment.

Many other reasons might be adduced for a general revision of the marriage laws. The marriage of English parties resident pro tempore in Scotland demands regulation. In the case of *Turner v. Wakefield* an act of parliament was passed to declare illegal a marriage solemnized in Scotland by fraud. We may reasonably suppose, therefore, that if the parties had not obtained that act, the marriage would have remained doubtful to the end of time. A Scotch divorce has been resorted to in one notorious instance for the convenience of persons of high rank, and marriages have subsequently been solemnized by the parties which are clearly illegal on this side of the Tweed, and which, if they had been followed by the birth of children, would, in all probability, have been set aside by the courts of law. In the celebrated case of *Dalrymple v. Dalrymple*, an English lady was betrayed into marriage with a man who had been previously married to another woman in Edinburgh; and it did not appear that the lady or her friends possessed any means of ascertaining what the real state of the case might be. These circumstances reflect no honour upon the institutions of our country, and they should not be permitted to recur. And if the Dissenters' Marriage Bill is brought forward again, it might be well to refer it, together with other parts of the subject, to a committee of the House of Lords, and to consider whether some general and permanent measure of relief cannot be devised by the wisdom which that House can command.

In the protracted discussion respecting Socinian weddings, there is no point which has been so completely proved as the in-

expediency of legislating hastily upon this subject. The petitioners come forward with a case of conscience, and demand immediate attention and redress: but there is no just ground for this demand. Those who deny the Divinity of our Saviour may, undoubtedly, entertain scruples against joining in a ceremony which makes express mention of the three persons in the Trinity. But as it is certain that the most distinguished members of the Sect are not prevented by their scruples from attending the service of the Church of England, and from thus assuming the character and appearance of worshippers of the Trinity, the scruple, however sincere and reasonable, cannot be very urgent. In fact we all know that it was suggested to the Socinians by the Free-thinking Christians; and though this may not alter the substantial merits of the case, or deprive the complaining parties of their right to complain, it shows that the actual grievance is not acutely felt, and that due time and consideration may be afforded for inquiry into the most appropriate remedy.

It has been said that the Socinians have a better ground of complaint against the marriage ceremony than other Dissenters, because the latter object to a ceremony, but the former to a doctrine. The quarter whence this observation proceeds, and the consequences which it appears to involve, demand the gravest attention. If the grievance in question is greater in proportion to the difference between the doctrines of the Church and of the party aggrieved, the Freethinking Christian, the Sceptic, and even the Atheist, are more aggrieved by our marriage ceremony than Dissenters, denying the Divinity of Christ. Were it fair to speculate respecting the comparative tenderness of different consciences, reasons might easily be assigned for believing that Sceptics are not less conscientious than Socinians. At all events, the difference between the unbeliever and the churchman is a difference not respecting ceremony, but respecting doctrine. And if the indulgence shown to the Socinian, on account of his tenets, is not extended to the Sceptic on a like account, the only assignable reason for such refusal must be the determination of Parliament to legislate for Christians only. Considering the manner in which the rights of conscience are pleaded in this question, it may be doubted whether any such distinction is tenable. But if it is tenable, we arrive at this conclusion, that the legislature will have regard to the doctrinal scruples of its subjects, provided they are ready to profess the fundamental principles of Christianity. And it will be necessary to show that the Socinian does profess the fundamental principles of Christianity, in order to distinguish his case from that of the unbeliever.

The question, therefore, even when argued on the ground of

conscience, is not an easy one. If churchmen are willing to admit scruples upon matters of doctrine, Dissenters, we may rest assured, will proceed a step further, and urge scruples upon matters of ceremony. If true liberality consents to extend indulgence to every thing which assumes the name of Christianity, false liberality will deny that the Christian has any superior rights, and will endeavour, according to custom, to place all men upon a level. And while the right inferences from the observation before us are, that nothing which is over and above the fundamental principles of Christianity ought to be contained in our marriage ceremony, and that the ceremony so reformed should be imposed upon all members of the community, the more popular and prevailing inferences will be, that the religious sanction ought to be entirely withdrawn, or that every sect should be permitted to marry according to their own rites.

The latter we regard as the necessary, and not very distant consequence of passing a Marriage Bill such as that which was introduced last year. And without knowing whether that or any other measure of a similar description will be brought before Parliament during this session, we take the present opportunity of inquiring into the effects of such a law. The defects of the bill of last year, even as amended by the House of Lords, are notorious. There is good reason to believe that its authors had no intention to carry the measure through Parliament. It was put forward, as several other plans had been before, for the purpose of feeling the way. The object was to elicit concessions, and admissions, and general expressions of good-will from some, to become acquainted with the objections of others, and to take advantage of the influence of an administration unanimously favourable to concession. Further than this, it was never intended to proceed; if the promoters of the measure had entertained the idea of completing the measure, they would have been forced to abandon their design. The bill contained the *fourth* remedy suggested by Mr. William Smith, for the grievances of the Dissenters. His first plan was to curtail the marriage ceremony by Act of Parliament, for the convenience of the Socinian. This was universally scouted by the Church and Senate. The second plan was to authorize the marriage of Socinians in their own chapels. This would have opened the door to the marriages of all other Dissenters in a similar manner, and have defeated the entire object of the Marriage Act. The third plan was to require the clergy to marry the parties in the vestry, a device at which we understand that Mr. Smith himself has now the grace to blush. The fourth, which, like Banquo's looking-glass, reflects many that are still unborn, provides that bans shall be published as at present in the Church, that the marriage

shall be solemnized by a justice of the peace, and that the solemnization shall be duly registered by the parish priest. Lord Lansdowne, with his usual caution, disclaimed all responsibility for the details of this extraordinary measure. Lord Eldon placed its manifold absurdities in so strong a light, that the advocates of the bill were unable to say a word in its defence. And the amendments which it subsequently received in the committee, while they removed a few of its more glaring enormities, left the inherent and essential evil precisely where they found it. The bill, as amended, still provides that the Dissenters' marriages shall be solemnized by one party and registered by another, which is inconsistent with the very notion of a record. The bill, as amended, still requires the clergy to publish bans, and keep registers for persons who refuse their ministrations and disown their doctrines, which is an intolerable insult upon the whole order. The bill, as amended, still enacts that a portion of His Majesty's subjects shall be married by a justice of the peace, which is neither more nor less than the first step towards the general desecration of marriage, the downfall of the Established Church, and the subversion of the Christian Religion.

With respect to the registration, no answer was returned to that part of Lord Eldon's objection, which pointed out the impropriety of the projected divorce between the ceremony of marriage and the record of it. The parish register is held to be the best possible evidence of marriage, because the entries are made at the conclusion of the solemnity, and signed by those who performed and witnessed it. But if the marriage takes place at one place, and the register is kept at another; if parties attend the justice to-day, and the vicar to-morrow; if the vicar registers, not what he himself has seen and done, but what was done by other persons on another occasion, the character of the transaction is changed, and instead of the best species of evidence, such a record is the worst that can be imagined. Many persons will not take the trouble of presenting themselves to the curate for registration, and the record will thus be incomplete. Some persons may choose to conceal the marriages into which they have entered before the justice, and the purpose for which a record is established will thus be defeated. A few may be wicked enough intentionally to destroy the evidence of their contract, and may accomplish their object in an instant by putting the justices' certificate into the fire. On the score of the insufficiency of the record, therefore, the proposed measure is indefensible.

To the second head of objection, that namely which relates to the imposition of a new and degrading duty upon the clergy, some reply was made; but it did not meet the difficulties of the case,

and subsequent inquiries have shown that the clergy dislike the proposed enactment. If any doubt be entertained respecting this fact, it may be solved by a very easy process. Let Mr. W. Smith, or any other Dissenter, bring in a bill, like that of last year, at the commencement of a Session of Parliament; let the bill be committed and printed in February, and public notice given that it will be passed or rejected in June, and we will undertake to say that nine-tenths of the clergy of this kingdom will petition the legislature against it. They will say that Parliament has hitherto required them to marry all descriptions of His Majesty's subjects, except Quakers and Jews. They will not deny that it has the power and the right to extend this exception to Socinians, but they will plead the hardship and absurdity of being converted into criers and clerks, of being required to publish bans and to register, when they are no longer permitted to celebrate marriage. If the nation withdraws the trust which has been confided to them, they will say, let it be withdrawn altogether. To take away an office or a privilege from one set of men and confer it upon another person, may be right; but to divide the marriage ceremony into three acts, leaving the first and last parts to the clergy, and empowering some worthier agents to step in at the middle of the comedy, is utterly inconsistent with the respect due to ministers of the Gospel; and if they submit patiently to such an imposition, they are traitors to their Church and to themselves.

Another attempt at apology for this part of the proposed measure was drawn from the practice of the Austrian government, as detailed in the very curious and valuable publication entitled *Catholicism in Austria*, by Count Ferdinand Dal Pozzo. With the most sincere respect, however, for the prelate from whom this apology proceeded, we must declare our inability to discern any such analogy between the cases as will justify the use that was made of them. The Austrian law is extremely simple. "In those places where there are Protestant pastors lawfully appointed, it belongs to them to baptize and marry the members of their own communion, and also to perform the funeral service for them. They are, however, under an obligation to give immediate notice of their baptisms, marriages, and deaths, to the Catholic priest of the district, that they may be enrolled in the registers which he is obliged to keep according to the forms prescribed by the civil laws. The Protestant registers, which contain the same articles, may prove very useful on some occasions."—*Catholicism in Austria*, p. 139. There is nothing here which bears the slightest resemblance to Mr. Smith's last bill. The religious concerns of the Protestants in Austria are managed by consistories instituted and approved by the Sovereign. All the newly-appointed pastors are

confirmed by these consistories. As the Roman Catholic religion predominates, it enjoys some privileges over the Protestant sects: The places of worship belonging to the latter have neither bells nor steeples, nor a public entrance fronting the squares or streets. The surplice fees, and other ecclesiastical revenues, are reserved for the Catholic priests, and "the registers of baptisms and marriages, as well as those of deaths, are also kept by them." (p. 136.) Here then we have Protestant clergymen governed and confirmed in their appointments by the Sovereign. These clergymen solemnize and *register the marriages, births and deaths* of their flock, and transmit copies of such register to the Catholic priest of the district, as the minister of the predominating sect. But what resemblance is there between the Protestant clergymen of Austria, and the justices of England, or even between the former and the Socinian teachers, who were intended by the bill of 1825 to perform the marriage ceremony for their own congregations. If the justice marries our English Socinians, marriage is thereby degraded to a civil contract, and it is this unhallowed rite that our clergy are expected to proclaim and record. If the Socinian teacher officiates, the law which authorizes him so to do, recognizes his ministrations as a preacher of the Gospel, and requires the clergy to join in the recognition. The marriage of Protestants in Austria is—as it ought to be—celebrated by their own clergy; those clergy being regularly ordained according to the forms of their respective churches, and recognized and controlled by the State. The English Socinian teacher is unconnected both with Church and State; he has no orders that deserve the name; he is not deemed worthy of keeping a register; and if he is never authorised to celebrate marriage in his conventicle, until a real precedent for such a measure be found in Austria, the commencement of his ecclesiastical privileges is still at an immense distance.

But the most novel and striking feature in the bill of last year was the solemnization of marriage by his majesty's justices of the peace. Lord Eldon pointed out the gross indecency and scandal of requiring all magistrates to discharge their duty according to the provisions of Mr. Smith's Bill, seeing that a large proportion of them are clergymen, pledged to abide by the rites and ceremonies of the church, and conscientiously opposed to the new form. The force of this objection was unanimously admitted, and words were introduced exempting such justices as were "clerks in holy orders" from the operation of the proposed law. But Lord Eldon omitted mentioning, what we are sure he will see as clearly and feel as strongly as we do, namely, that another very large portion of the justices of peace are members,

if not ministers, of the church, and have a right to some little consideration in this business. Is a conscientious layman, who regards marriage as a sacred thing, and thinks it as unbecoming to join a couple in holy matrimony, as to ascend the pulpit, or officiate in the congregation, entitled to no attention? There are many lay magistrates who would sincerely scruple to invade the priest's office by solemnizing matrimony. Upon the very same principle, therefore, which exempts the clerical magistrate, must the lay magistrate, being a member of the church of England, be exempted likewise. If the anti-trinitarian must be married by a justice, an anti-trinitarian justice should be found for the purpose. If there are no anti-trinitarian justices to be met with, the inference will be that anti-trinitarians themselves are scarce; but that can give them no right to force themselves, and their lay-marriages upon the members of a different communion, who profess a purer faith, and have some remaining regard for the laws and usages of Christendom.

Another and not a trifling objection to this new employment of his majesty's justices of the peace is, that similar functions were committed to them once before, and not at a very auspicious period of our history. In the year 1653, a certain assembly, known by the name of Barebones's Parliament, enacted that from the 29th September next ensuing, all persons who should agree to be married within the commonwealth of England should have bans published three times in the church or chapel, or else in the market-place, and should then come before some justice of peace, and be married in the following form. The man was to say, "I, A. B. do here, in the presence of God, the searcher of all hearts, take thee, C. D., for my wedded wife, and do also, in the presence of God, and before these witnesses, promise to be to thee a loving and faithful husband." The woman was to repeat similar words, with an addition in the last clause, which pledged her to be, "a loving, faithful and obedient wife." Now these words, with a very slight abbreviation, were adopted by Mr. William Smith, in the first bill of last year; that, namely, which required the clergyman to marry Socinians in the vestry. The use of the vestry was entirely unprecedented, but the declaration to be made therein was borrowed from Praise-God Barebones. "I, A. B., do take thee, C. D., for my wedded wife, and do here, in the presence of God, and before these witnesses, promise to be unto thee a loving and faithful husband." And so closely was the precedent followed, that the lady, as in Cromwell's time, was required to promise that she should be "a loving, faithful and obedient wife." In the amended bill, which was introduced into the House of Lords by Lord Lansdowne, these precious words were retained; but the Lords' committee adopted another

form, viz., "I, A. B., do take and acknowledge thee, C. D., for my wedded wife, before these witnesses." And in like manner, "I, C. D., do take and acknowledge thee, A. B., for my wedded husband, before these witnesses." Thus by the bill as it now stands, the Socinian is deprived of that promise of obedience, which other men are entitled to receive from their helpmates; the favourite words of Barebones are not allowed to deform the Statute Book, and every allusion to religion, or even to the omnipresence of God, is rigorously excluded.

We are aware that the object of this amendment was to distinguish Socinian from Christian marriage, and to make the former a civil contract, and nothing more. For this purpose, even the solemnity of an oath was dispensed with, lest it should be supposed that the lay justice of the peace interfered improperly in spiritual things. This is somewhat strange, since the justice administers oaths every day of his life, without being suspected of invading the priest's office. But on the whole we are grateful for the alteration. In the first place, because it delivers us from that ill-omened form, which was the pride of Cromwell and the boast of Barebones; and in the second, because it exposes the consequences of the proposed enactment in their naked deformity—proclaiming the total desecration of the proposed marriages—and bringing the contending parties fairly to issue upon the question, shall marriage be connected with religion, or shall it not? In the commencement of this article we have adverted to the divine institution of the marriage state, and we have traced the existing marriage system of Europe to its only true source, the Gospel of Jesus Christ; and though we have been compelled to dissent from Mr. Morgan's opinion respecting the *necessity* of marriage by a priest, we have shown by the evidence of a witness above suspicion, that in all Christian countries, it has been "a religious, as well as a natural, and civil contract," that "heaven itself is made a party to it," and that "the consent of the individuals pledged to each other is ratified and consecrated by a vow to God?" This practice, hallowed by time and trial, has worked itself into the habits and opinions of the people, has strengthened and sanctified the nuptial bond, and cannot now be changed without making a rent in the moral feelings of the country, weakening what it is sound policy to strengthen, and endangering what ought at all events to be preserved. There is nothing to be said in favour of the proposed innovation, except that marriage is a civil contract. Lord Stowell and Blackstone have been quoted in favour of this opinion, but they have been quoted unfairly. The former, in that passage to which we have just alluded, and which must still be in the recollection of our readers, declares the di-

rect reverse of what he is so often vouched to prove. And Blackstone states that “ *Our law considers marriage in no other light than as a civil contract. The holiness of the matrimonial state is left entirely to the ecclesiastical law, the temporal courts not having jurisdiction to consider unlawful marriage as a sin, but merely as a civil inconvenience.*”—vol. i. p. 433. Here is an evident distinction between the common and the ecclesiastical law; and unless it is pretended that the latter is no part of the law of England, Blackstone does not say that the law of England regards marriage as a civil contract. In fact, the courts of common law, which consider marriage only as a civil contract, can take no cognizance of marriage except as it may be connected with title to property. Matrimonial suits, properly so called, can only be tried in the ecclesiastical courts; and Mr. Smith will not deny that in those courts marriage is regarded as something more than a civil contract. What is marriage independently of the law as laid down in the ecclesiastical courts? It is not necessarily the marriage now prevailing in Europe. It may be marriage with four wives, or with forty. It may be marriage admitting of divorce at the pleasure of the husband. It is only in Christian countries that the union by us called marriage can be strictly said to exist. If it be merely a civil contract, what shall prevent such contract assuming any of the different forms under which it is known in different parts of the world? What prevented it in England before the Marriage Act—what prevents it now in Scotland or in the colonies? The canon law, the ecclesiastical law, the Christian law; which, founded upon the words of the Saviour of the World, forbids men to marry more wives than one. The very essence of the contract rests upon religious ordinances. The very meaning of the term is to be sought in the ecclesiastical law, and yet we are gravely told that the aid of religion may be safely dispensed with throughout the whole transaction.

Even if it could be shown, that the courts of law hold marriage to be merely a civil contract, another important question would remain, what do the people hold it to be? If they deem it of religious obligation, the effect of tampering with the existing practice would be to diminish the present reverence for the contract; and whether it is desirable to make men less scrupulous on the subject than they now are is a point which need not be discussed. What would the mass of the people think of marriage, if it ever became the custom of all dissenters to be married by justices of the peace? Either, as in France, they would think such marriages invalid, or they would look upon their own ceremony as superstitious and unnecessary, and upon the duties now

resulting from it, as of no force. In France, where the law imposes a civil ceremony on all, and leaves the performance of a religious ceremony to the discretion of the different parties, a vast majority of the people appeal to religion for a ratification of the marriage contract. And if this is not done, the consequences are, that persons legally married are not considered as husband and wife; they are degraded in the eyes of their neighbours, and in their own eyes; and from this degradation there springs up an infinity of disorders, scandalous, afflicting and disgraceful. Too often the result is that parties thus united, and the unfortunate fruits of their union, are summoned before the civil tribunals to answer for their offences against the law.*

The same effect will be produced in this country, if marriages by the civil magistrate are of rare occurrence. If they are frequent, which, when once sanctioned by the law, they probably will be, the disease will take another turn. In that case irregular marriage will no longer be held in abhorrence; but all marriages will be lowered in public estimation. The bonds of domestic happiness will be slackened; libertinism, emboldened by the prospect of impunity, will spread its sickening influence around, and they, who believed that in passing a Dissenters' Marriage Act they are merely listening to the just claims of a wounded conscience, will find that they have dislocated and deranged the very joints and hinges of society. There is no example on record of a country which has generally or permanently dispensed with a religious ratification of marriage. If England is destined to try the experiment, we pray that she may pass uninjured through the fire; but we apprehend that every institution will be endangered, and every tie relaxed, and the overflowings of ungodliness rush like a torrent over our miserable land. The infidel, secret or avowed, may consistently maintain that we have no further need of religious teaching respecting the marriage state, nor of religious sanctions confirming the marriage vow. But, in spite of infidels, we can prove that the existing theory and practice of marriage has been derived directly from the Gospel; and he that attempts to break the chain which still unites them with each other, attempts to put asunder that which God himself hath joined.

And over and above the religious and moral objections to an infraction of the existing law, let the political consequences be considered. The great object of the Marriage Act is to prevent clandestine marriages, and doubtful marriages. At present, with two trifling exceptions, all persons are required to marry in the

* *Denonciation aux Cours Royaux, par M. le Comte de Montlosier.*—App. p. 310.

Church, and the consequence is a complete, a safe, and accessible register of every marriage solemnized in this country. Next to the sanctity of the marriage vow, these are the chief points which a marriage law is intended to secure, and every one of them will be abandoned when the Dissenters' Marriage Bill is adopted by parliament. Some such measure as the existing Marriage Act is indispensable. Every country has adopted it: Austria, as we have already seen, permits the celebration of marriage both in Catholic and Protestant Churches, but provides for the maintenance of one common register in which all marriages must be enrolled. France, in former days, suffered so severely from clandestine and doubtful marriages, that her representatives at the Council of Trent were the chief promoters of the celebrated canon already quoted, which pronounces all such marriages null and void. The existing law of that country provides with extreme care, for the publicity and enrolment of the contract. The name, domicile, and age of parties intending to marry are published at the door of the hall of the commune, and a copy of the deed of publication remains affixed to the door of the hall for eight successive days. The marriage is celebrated in the same hall by the municipal officer of the commune, in the presence of four witnesses, and an act announcing the event is immediately drawn up and recorded. It is only in virtue of this *act* that the rights belonging to marriage can be maintained in that country. With the substitution of a civil for a religious ceremony, this law closely resembles our own Marriage Act, and if once that Act is touched, recourse must be had to the practice now established in France. It is said that the Scotch go on very well without a Marriage Act, and that the exception of Quakers and Jews from the provisions of our Marriage Act, upsets the argument for the necessity of one general system. Astonishment has frequently been expressed at the paucity of mischief arising out of the Scotch system, but the circumstance is not incapable of explanation. The cautious temper of the people, their strict attention to genealogies, and the comparative smallness of their numbers, will account for much that we witness. If, however, the population increases, especially in towns, as it has increased for the last twenty years, it needs no prophet to foresee that some general system of registration will soon be called for.

The cases of the Quakers and Jews are considered highly favourable to the Dissenting cause, yet with respect to securing the publicity and the evidence of marriage, they do not, in reality, assist it. The peculiar customs of these two remarkable classes afford almost as safe a guarantee for the accurate registration of their marriages as solemnization at Church. The Quakers re-

quire that parties intending to marry, shall declare their intention at the monthly meetings whereof they are members. The parents or guardians must declare or certify their consent, and persons are appointed to inquire into the clearness of the parties from other marriage engagements, and report the result to the next monthly meeting, when, if no objection arise, liberty is granted to the parties to solemnize the marriage at their regular meeting-house. A formal certificate of the solemnization is drawn up, and witnessed, at the time when it takes place, and the monthly meeting provides that the register is duly signed, witnessed, and preserved.

Nor can the exemption of the Jews from the operation of the Marriage Act be taken advantage of by other persons, or lead to clandestine or doubtful marriages. Lord Stowell has decided, in the case of *Lindo v. Belisario*, that no Jewish marriage is good unless in addition to the ceremony of *betrothment*, which resembles a clandestine wedding, or, perhaps, more properly, espousals—a formal contract be entered into by the bride and bridegroom in the Hebrew language, and such contract be drawn up by the priest, and be entered and registered in a book kept by him for that purpose; and the entry must be signed by the bridegroom and other witnesses. Nor is this all—a third ceremony remains to be performed. The man either brings home the woman to his house in a public and ostensible manner, or, as is more usual in this country, the bride and bridegroom, after the contract and benediction, are introduced, under a pavilion or canopy, attended by the relations and friends. None of these observances can be safely dispensed with—and they remove all serious apprehension of clandestine marriages among the Jews.

It is plain, therefore, that the exception of Quakers and Jews from the operation of the English Marriage Act, whatever it may appear in theory, is of little consequence in practice. These small and well-defined communities have not stripped matrimony of its religious sanction—for Quakers are married at a religious meeting, and Jews receive the benediction of their priests. Their customs are a sufficient guarantee against the admission of persons not belonging to their society to the benefit of their peculiar privilege, and evidence of their marriages is preserved with strict care. But what guarantee will exist upon any one of these points, when the Socinian is married by his justice of peace, or even by his religious teacher? How will it be possible to limit the new privilege to Socinians, or any other Dissenters? How will it be possible to keep accurate and public registers, without calling in the services of the parochial clergy? The injustice of making such a demand is now generally admitted; and if the plan

laid down by the Marriage Act is abandoned, nothing effectual can be substituted for it short of an adoption of the French system. The simplest and best change would be to appoint municipal officers in every parish, and imitate all the rest of the Gallican machinery. John Bull might not relish such an arrangement, which is better suited to a people long accustomed to despotism, legitimate or usurped, than to our liberty-loving countrymen, who have no partiality for such forms. But we know of no other which will prevent clandestine marriages, and perpetuate the evidence of lawful marriages, without having recourse to the clergy. If the fashionable liberality of the age is to break down piece after piece of the existing law, in compliance with each succeeding scruple of conscience, we had better come at once, to what we must come at last; we had better make the validity of every marriage depend upon its due celebration before the civil officer, and leave it to the parties themselves to add, or to omit the religious ratification. Much as we should deplore such an arrangement, we should prefer it, infinitely, to that system of vexatious, temporizing interference, which is recognised in Mr. Smith's bill; and if that bill be successful, it will be repeated again and again, until every sect has its own marriage law, and the country at large has none at all. Let the present edifice be demolished, and prudent persons will hasten to construct some other sanctuary, in which religion, and morality, and "the bed undefiled," may still find refuge. But let not the nation be cozened out of her cherished institutions by pettifogging encroachments. If the Church is to be repudiated, let sentence be pronounced without delay—but let the spirit of her slumbering sons be aroused to counteract the insidious sap, which is now in preparation against her bulwarks. If her enemies are not counteracted, they will persist in their present course; they will take away a brick to-day, and a beam to-morrow; they will stop up a window this year, and a door the next; and the whole will go to decay, by insensible degrees, without the dignity of an honourable fall. We trust to the Legislature and the Government to protect us against such a calamity. We implore them to look carefully to the consequences, before they surrender one jot of the present law. The divine institution of marriage, and its revival and purification under the influence of Christianity are ample reasons for refusing to degrade the holy state of matrimony to a mere civil contract. And while it remains a religious contract, it must be celebrated by the clergy,—the State cannot commit the responsible office of witnessing and recording the marriages of the people to any ministers of religion except those of the Established Church.

ART. IX.—*A Letter to the Right Hon. Robert Peel, on the Subject of the London University.* By Christianus. London. Murray. 1828. pp. 40.

WHEN the scheme of an University for this metropolis was first announced to the public, it naturally became a subject of serious and immediate interest to the reflecting members of our Establishment; and there were two points of view in which they were compelled to consider it:—1st, As to the auspices under which it appeared; and, 2d, The character and objects of the education proposed in it. In neither of these, however, was it calculated, upon a first view, to afford them satisfaction. The patrons and promoters of the scheme, whatever other merits or distinctions they might claim, (and we are not disposed to detract from them,) were unquestionably in no wise remarkable for their attachment to the Church of England. Many of them were Scotchmen, others were Dissenters; and altogether they constituted a body to whom the community at large would not willingly have delegated the delicate and important task of forming and superintending a system of education for their youth; nor was it a small matter in the account, that they had selected, as the herald of their praise and the expounder of their opinions, that very journal whose pages had been frequently marked by a spirit of hostility towards those venerable academical institutions, which we esteem amongst the richest portions of our patrimony—institutions intimately connected in our minds with all that is most valuable in our Establishment and Laws, and consecrated in our hearts by the memory of the wise and good, who, in various ages, have gone forth from their walls, to diffuse light and knowledge and religion over the land.

But if the auspices under which the new scheme appeared (for new it was in a most essential sense) were calculated to awaken our fears, the character of the instruction was by no means likely to allay them. From the very first it was fairly and distinctly avowed as a fundamental principle arising necessarily out of the constitution of their scheme, that Christian discipline and instruction would form no part of it; that while every mental faculty was to be cultivated, and every intellectual want would be supplied—the one thing needful was to be withheld, and the immortal prospects of those who should resort to them would be disregarded. Under these circumstances, emanating from such a source, and bearing in its front this capital defect, we cannot wonder that the scheme was coldly received by the public, or that so small a portion of the energies and resources of the country should have been moved in its behalf.* To the Establishment

* Of the Nobility, who have become contributors, there appears to be less than thirty; of Members of the House of Commons, under fifty; not a single Judge; very

in particular the conjuncture must have been exceedingly ominous. Defective laws may sometimes be prevented of their sinister effects by a salutary countervailing principle in those who administer them; and, on the other hand, a defective superintendence may be kept in order by the stubborn and unbending spirit of the laws; but when both the laws themselves and their administrators have the same bias, what hope can there be of any effectual resistance or restraint? Notwithstanding these prejudices, it must be confessed that the indisposition to the University was of no violent or obtrusive kind. It was a sentiment rather felt than expressed, or, if shown at all, appearing more in a decorous negation of support than in any active and substantive opposition. And good reason there was for this reserve. The liberal friends of the Church were well aware that in a country rising rapidly, like this, in wealth and population, and inflamed with an unusual ardour for knowledge, there was a call for more enlarged means of education than the existing institutions could supply. They were not insensible that plausible reasons might be urged in excuse even for the capital defect we have mentioned, and they felt that somewhat of the weight of their own objection would depend upon the extent to which the scheme might be carried, and upon the pretensions which were hereafter to be set up. They waited therefore patiently for that fuller development of the plan which had been promised to them; and though by no means sanguine in their expectations, they were anxious to learn by what healing measures it was proposed to compensate for this gross and palpable defect, and by what charm the promoters of the University could hope to reconcile an enlightened and Christian people to the exclusion of religion from the minds of youth, at the very moment and under the very circumstances in which they most require it? This Statement has at last appeared from the Council, and we are now in a condition fully to comprehend and to appreciate the nature and objects of their plan. We wish it were in our power to add that it contained anything calculated to remove, or even to qualify, our objection. But the contrary is the case. The exclusion of religion is still strictly and tenaciously adhered to, while the danger to be apprehended from it is increased by the decided extension of their views. Already thousands of pupils are reckoned as within their grasp; and not only the youth of the metropolis, permanently or occasionally residing in it, are expected to become members, but those of the provinces and the country are invited to domiciliate around their precincts. There is no longer therefore any occasion for reserve; and it remains for the friends of the

few eminent Lawyers; only one Bishop; few other Clergymen; and what may be considered as no doubtful indication of public opinion, only a very few, comparatively speaking, of the more opulent and respectable Merchants and Bankers of London.

Establishment—and more particularly for those whose habits and studies impress upon them more forcibly the indispensable value of Christian discipline and instruction—to state plainly and firmly their objections to a system which so openly denies it; to examine the soundness of the reasons which have been assigned for this omission, and to point out its true character and effects; and, finally, to declare openly, whether any learning they promise can compensate for that which they withhold, or any precaution they devise can avail against the baneful effects of their omission. It is not, let it be remembered, a mere question affecting the Establishment, which is at stake, though that would be grave enough, but it is the cause of Christianity itself, and of all those bright and benignant influences which affect the morals, the manners, and the temper of mankind.

This task has been executed, in the pamphlet before us, and in such a manner as to leave us little to desire. It is written with great strength and clearness, and with all that earnestness and seriousness which become the gravity of the subject. It has the merit, too, of comprising, in a small compass, all the important points in which this question can be viewed. Further it is fair and liberal both in its reasoning and its views: the defect complained of is stated in the words of the Council; and none of their reasons or suggestions connected with it are withheld: and, thus, the reader is left to determine between them. We recommend the work strongly to those who have not yet made up their minds upon the subject, as well as to those who have acceded hastily to the plan. As for the staunch friends and supporters of the measure, we need not press it upon them; they must read it, and answer it: they cannot neglect it with impunity.

Passing lightly over the inquiry—whether increased means of academical instruction are required or not in the existing circumstances of the country? which he decides, we think properly, in the affirmative, he enters at once upon the question, whether an institution so constituted as the London University, is calculated satisfactorily to supply that want?

“The fundamental defect in this institution, to which I allude, is *the entire omission of every thing connected with Christianity* among the topics of instruction which are to be imparted to the youth received there for education. Professors are to be appointed on every other branch of useful knowledge; lectures are to be given in all the sciences, in Greek and Roman literature, in moral and political philosophy, in jurisprudence, in medicine, in history ancient and modern; in every subject which commonly forms a part of general or professional education; but the topic of Revealed Religion is studiously, absolutely, and avowedly omitted. I think it right, in order to avoid even the appearance of misrepresentation, to state thus early, that the founders of the institution explain in their prospectus the reasons of this omission. They

explain that it arises, not from choice, but from necessity; not from indifference to the importance of the subject, but from the inability to devise any plan, by which instruction in religion can be made consistent with the admission of persons of all religious persuasions to the advantages of the institution; and they expect that all necessary instruction in religion will be supplied by the parents or guardians of the young men, who are placed there as students. This part of their statement I propose shortly to consider a little more at large. At present, I merely mention the *fact*, that in this institution, destined to be a great national institution, and bearing the imposing name of the London University, Christianity is entirely omitted; no instructions are to be given on its evidences or its doctrines, no religious services are to be performed within its walls. In fact, it would appear that the Bible is to be as much an unknown book, and the Christian religion an unknown subject, within the precincts of the University of London, as would be the case in an university founded at modern Constantinople, or as would have been the case in one established at ancient Rome.—p. 5, 6.

Having thus stated the character of the defect, and shown afterwards in the clearest manner, that it was quite a novelty in the country, and that, in every other similar institution amongst us, general education is always built upon the foundation of religion; he thus proceeds—

“Hitherto our nation has borne the character of a religious and a moral nation. However we may have had, and may still have, to deplore individual instances of departure from religious principles and practices, yet we have lived as a Christian people, our laws are founded on Christianity, our youth have been bred in Christian principles. In our legislature, in all our great public institutions, in all our forms and modes of life, we have hitherto paid attention to the decencies of religion, we have shown that we feel the weight of Christian obligation. Why then is this ill-omened separation now, for the first time, to take place? Why, for the first time since we became a Christian nation, are we called upon to witness an attempt to conduct systematically the education of our youth, on the principle of the entire omission of all instruction in that holy religion which we publicly profess?”—p. 8.

The College of Surgeons, and other institutions for lectures are properly shown to be out of the case, because they are none of them intended to furnish a *system of education*, as the London University professes to do. But the novelty of the omission is the least pernicious part of it, and the author next undertakes to show that both the tendency as well as the direct effects must be injurious in a high degree to the religious principles, and of course to the happiness, of the nation.

“But, in the next place, independently of the *novelty* of this feature in the New London University, no considerate person can doubt that the tendency of this very important omission will be, if the Institution should grow to the magnitude and influence which are contemplated by the projectors, to lead to a general laxity of religious principles, and indifference to Christian duties. The reasons (whether valid or not) given

for the omission of theology from the topics of instruction, would be known only to a few; but the fact itself would be borne upon the surface, would be obvious to every eye and exhibited in the daily practice. All branches of knowledge, useful or ornamental, from the highest to the lowest, would be held forth in the ostensible titles of the Institution as deserving the attention and study of youth, and as tending to improve and exercise the faculties of their minds; while religion would be kept in the back ground, and passed over as if deserving of no regard. Can it admit a doubt, that the mere fact of this omission would foster and encourage the habit of treating the subject with indifference; that it would tend to make it occupy a low place in the minds of youth, instead of that high place which it ought to hold, and to induce the opinion that the time devoted to the study of it is time withheld from more improving or more useful occupations! That worldly studies and temporal occupations, in general, too much withdraw the attention from the business of religion and the concerns of eternity, has been the complaint of the divine and the moralist in every age. That, in the present day, the influence of Christian principles on the minds of men, is not too powerful, and that the studies (most valuable in themselves) which appertain to matters of literary taste and science, are apt to engross the attention, and to call it off from religion, is very generally felt. If then such be the common tendency of our nature, to which some counteracting force is at all times required, can it be wise or prudent, can it be consistent with the true interests of the nation, can it conduce to the advancement of individual happiness, or of the public welfare, to found an University for the general instruction of youth, in which no religious feeling is to be impressed upon the mind? I address this, of course, to Christians, to persons who acknowledge the truth, and feel the value of revealed religion, and who believe it to be no matter of indifference to the happiness of mankind, whether its genuine influence be augmented or impaired.

“Independently, however, of the effect of the *name* of the total omission of religion from the topics of instruction, and this in a world where we all are led and greatly influenced by names, the *reality* of the thing is of far deeper importance. For is it possible to conceive that a number of young men, destined for liberal professions, should be passing through a course of education, of which religion is not only *not* made the basis, but from which it is totally excluded;—in which not a thought or feeling is directed towards the subject:—I say, is it possible to conceive that a number of young men, estimated by the founders *at the least* to be 3000, and conjectured by them to be greatly more, should receive a public education at an University, should be instructed by system on every point of useful knowledge, *except* religion, and that no bad effect should be produced on the religious feelings of our nation?—pp. 9—12.

The author next shows that the difficulty urged by the Council against lectures in divinity might as fairly be applied to those upon morality and even history.

Admitting the principle that in a Christian country no code of ethics should or ought to be taught, but that which is grounded on the Bible, he thus proceeds to argue:

"But it certainly appears to me that much the same reason applies against their teaching *any* system of ethics or *any* moral philosophy, as against their teaching theology. For the reason which they allege for declining to teach theology, is that, considering the number of modes under which Christianity is professed, they could not adopt any one which would be acceptable to the parents of all the pupils. Precisely, for the same reason, they cannot adopt any form or system of ethics which will be approved by all. The Jewish parent will have reason to object, if any part of it be drawn from the Christian Scriptures, or grounded upon them. The freethinking, or deistical parent, will object, if reference be made to any part of the book of Revelation, the authority of which he denies. And perhaps the parent who disbelieves the being or the providence of a God, (if such an one unhappily be found,) will object to the grounds of moral obligation being laid on conformity to the will of God; he will desire that reference should be made solely to present expediency, or to the eternal fitness of things. The answer to all this, on the part of the supporters of the Institution, is sufficiently obvious. They will naturally say, 'It is our business and our duty to provide that system of ethics which we deem the best, and the most acceptable to the great majority of the nation.' Precisely of the same nature *ought to be* their answer on the subject of theology. Instead of wholly omitting all instruction in religion, because the opinions of men are divided, they ought to say, 'We adopt that form and system of Christianity which we believe to be the purest and the best, and which we find to be most approved by the nation at large.'

"Again, I perceive that Professors are to be appointed to give lectures on history, ancient and modern. Now, I cannot refrain from asking, how will these lectures be shaped, so as to square with the *liberal* principles on which the University is founded, and not do violence to the feelings of some or other of the pupils? Will the Professors, for instance, in treating of the history of the Jews, adapt their observations to the opinion of the disciple of Voltaire, or to that of the believer in Divine Revelation? When they touch upon the early history of Christianity, will they adopt views approved by the enemies of our faith, or the contrary? When they enter on the historical details connected with the Reformation, will they venture to disgust their Roman Catholic pupils by giving Protestant views, or will they shock the feelings of Protestants by calling Luther an incarnate dæmon, and blackening, with Dr. Lingard, the memory of the good Archbishop Cranmer? I merely throw out these questions to show that endless and insurmountable perplexities are likely to embarrass their system of education; and to prove, if proof can be desired, how impossible it is that they should, consistently with their principles, give a steady direction to the minds of youth on the most important subjects."—pp. 16—18.

Having offered these general observations, the author next applies himself to the consideration of that portion of the Council's statement, which relates to the omission of theology; and which, in fairness to both parties we have inserted in a note below.*

* "The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge supply ample opportunities for the education of the clergy of the Established Church. It is a fundamental principle of

"In proceeding to observe upon this extract, I would mention my entire acquiescence in that which is stated at the beginning, that the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge supply ample means of educating the clergy of the Established Church. I wish the observations here made, to be considered as applying solely to those students who are destined for lay professions.

"In the first place then, I am gratified at finding it admitted in this extract, that theological instruction, or the formation of the religious principles, is 'THE GREAT AND PRIMARY OBJECT OF EDUCATION,' and that this is a subject 'FAR TOO IMPORTANT FOR COMPROMISE.' Thus, by their own admission, while the founders of this Institution establish an University for the systematic education of youth, they establish it on a plan which compels them, by necessity as they profess, to omit 'the great and primary object of education.' Can it be wise or politic to attempt to found an University, which, by their own confession, is defective in the main and essential part? They state, at the opening of the preceding paragraph, that 'It is a fundamental principle of the University of London that it shall be open to persons of all religious denominations;' and from this fundamental principle arises that necessity which they apparently deplore, of omitting, in their scheme, the great and primary object of education. Thus, while they acknowledge that their plan of education is essentially defective, they, themselves knowingly and designedly create that necessity through which it becomes so.

the University of London, that it shall be open to persons of all religious denominations; and it was manifestly impossible to provide a course of professional education for the ministers of religion of those congregations who do not belong to the Established Church. It was equally impossible to institute any theological lectures for the instruction of lay students of different religious persuasions, which would not have been liable to grave objections; still less was it practicable to introduce any religious observances that could be generally complied with. In the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the students, removed from the superintendence of their parents and guardians, are placed in colleges, or new domestic establishments, where it is necessary that religious instruction should be provided. In the case of the University of London, none of the students will reside within the walls; they will live in the houses of their parents or guardians; and those who come from a distance will live in houses selected by their friends, with such precautions for the safety of their morals and of their religious opinions as will naturally be adopted on the occasion. A plan is in contemplation, (which will be more fully explained in a subsequent part of this Statement,) by which those students who come from a distance may be boarded in houses where they will be under the guidance of persons of their own religious opinions, and where they will be subjected to rules of discipline for the protection of their morals. The religious education of the pupils, therefore, will be left to domestic superintendence, being the same provision which at present exists for that important object in all cases except those of under-graduates at Oxford and Cambridge during their residence in College. There are many hundred of young men constantly in London, who come from the country for the sake of professional education in Law and Medicine, who have no guide for their religious education, unless they find it in relatives or friends interested in their welfare. To all such persons the discipline intended to be enforced in the University of London within its walls, will constitute an additional check upon their conduct.

"The Council had many long and anxious deliberations upon this subject, which they felt to be of paramount importance; but they found it impossible to unite the principle of free admission to persons of all religious denominations with any plan of theological instruction, or any form of religious discipline; and they were thus compelled by necessity to leave this great and primary object of education, which they deem far too important for compromise, to the direction and superintendence of the natural guardians of the pupils."—pp. 12, 13.

But, even on their own principles I confess that I cannot agree that the positive necessity which they allege really exists, of omitting all instruction connected with theology, because the students are of different religious persuasions. In the first place, it is as necessary for the Presbyterian and the Baptist, as for the member of the Church of England, to be acquainted with the evidences of Christianity, and with the general contents of the sacred volume on which their common faith is founded. This is knowledge which concerns all Christians in common. Hence, the circumstance of admitting students of different persuasions would not afford the slightest impediment to the establishment of theological lectures embracing this very important part of religious education. In the next place, I am not aware of any reason why professors of theology should not be appointed to instruct the students according to the several modes of faith in which their parents desire that they should be brought up. There might be the professor belonging to the Church of England, who should teach the members of this church : the Presbyterian professor, who should instruct the Presbyterians ; the Baptist and the Roman Catholic professors, who should severally take the members of their own sects under their tuition. It cannot be alleged that there would be a want of a sufficient number of students to admit this subdivision of theological professors ; for the prospectus states the expected number to amount to several thousands. Nor would it be necessary to provide a distinct professor for every minute sect, as, for instance, the New Jerusalemites, or the Swedenborgians, or the Ranters. Probably few students, if any, of these persuasions would apply for admission ; and, if they did, their cases might be considered as excepted. Possibly, it may be answered that this plan would bear hard upon those who are not Christians, as Jews, Freethinkers, and Deists of every description. But if the spirit of liberalism, in which the University is founded, should so far extend, there would not be the slightest difficulty in having a professor of rabbinical learning, and also professors of Freethinking and of Deism, suited to the respective degrees, systems, and shades of non-belief, which the parents profess."—pp. 18—23.

We cannot follow the author through the remainder of his work, which is occupied in considering very briefly a question naturally presenting itself to all who agree with him in his reasoning ; viz. what is the best practicable plan, which may at once counteract the influence of an institution founded on so defective a principle, and supply those larger means for a sound, liberal, and religious education, which the country seems to require. It may suffice to say, however, that after touching upon various schemes which have been proposed by others, he comes to the following conclusion, that the only way to attain these objects, is to found " another London University, in which it shall be made, of course, an essential part of the education imparted, to imbue the minds of youth with the principles of Christianity, according to those sounder forms which are established in this kingdom ; and in which the services of religion shall be performed as directed in our National Church." (p. 33, 34.)

For ourselves, we are convinced that the London University can never flourish, scarcely even drag on an inglorious existence, if she persist in the maintenance of a principle so new and unheard-of in any Christian country, so injurious to the best interests of humanity, and so utterly repugnant to the prejudices, feelings, and habits of the British nation. If Religion be, in truth, a concern too important for compromise, it is surely a concern too important for neglect; and if it be deprived of its true place and honour in the system and within their walls, what security can be given, what device can be imagined, that it shall be properly cultivated elsewhere? Putting the Church, therefore, entirely out of the question, we are satisfied that even the Dissenters themselves, to whom the hopes and consolations of Christianity ought to be as dear as to ourselves, when no longer dazzled, as at present, with the novelty of their situation, and the specious simplicity of the plan, can never long submit to have their children left to indifference or to chance, for that instruction, which it requires all the weight of authority, and all the warmth of affection, effectually to inculcate and confirm. Already symptoms of disaffection and remonstrance have appeared in the camp itself, which will probably soon ripen into a more animated and successful resistance. Till that day comes we have only to wish that her influence and operations and example may be circumscribed by her own walls;

“ — se jactet in anlâ

Æolus, et clauso ventorum carcere regnet.”

Whether, under other circumstances, the Church of England, pre-eminent as she is in all our establishments and institutions, could wisely unite in so wide a plan; whether she would well consult her own dignity and interest by descending into an arena occupied by so many conflicting sects, is a question which will be best argued when the case arrives. In any circumstances, the plan suggested by the author, of another London University, would remove the difficulty. At present, however, the question is of another kind, and the course of the friends of the Establishment is clear.

In justice both to the author himself, as well as to the persons alluded to in the following passage, we have been desirous to insert it:—

“ I feel that some apology is due to the noble and distinguished persons whose names appear in the Council of ‘ the London University,’ for the freedom of remark with which their ‘ Statement’ has been treated. But I have had the less scruple in making these remarks, from believing that, while these individuals have granted the use of their names, they have had little or no concern in the practical details of the plan which has been prepared and submitted to the public.”—p. 38.

STATE OF THE DIOCESES

IN

ENGLAND AND WALES,

FROM JANUARY TO MARCH INCLUSIVE.

PREFERRED.

Preferment.	County.	Preferred.	Patron.
Canterbury.			
Leysdown, <i>V.</i>	Kent . .	Theodosius Wood	His Grace the Arbp.
Prebend in the Cathed- } ral Church . . . }	Kent . .	Dr. H. Spry . .	The King.
York.			
Cromwell, <i>R. with</i> } Orston, <i>V.</i> . . . }	Notts. . .	C. J. F. Clinton }	Duke of Newcastle, Dn. & Ch. of Lincoln.
London.			
Bloomsbury, } St. George, <i>R.</i> . . }	Middlesex .	John Lonsdale .	Lord Chancellor.
Rumford, <i>Chap.</i> . . .	Essex . .	J. E. Rathbone }	Warden and Fellows of New Coll. Oxford.
Stansted Mount- } Fitchet, <i>V.</i> . . . }	Essex . .	Joseph Torriam	E. F. Maitland, Esq.
Tey, Great, <i>Sin. Rec.</i> .	Essex . .	R. S. Dixon . .	S. Thornton, Esq.
Durham.			
Norton, <i>V.</i>	Durham .	Charles Plumer .	The Lord Bishop.
Winchester.			
Minor Canonry in } Cathedral Church . }	Hants . .	W. D. Harrison }	Dean and Chapter of Winchester.
Winnall, <i>R.</i>	Hants . .	M. Taylor . .	The Lord Bishop.

Preferment.	County.	Preferred.	Patron.
Bath and Wells.			
Bawdrip, R. . . .	Somerset .	John Bowen .	{ R. Bush, Esq. and Adml. Sir H. Nicholls.
Butleigh, V. with Baltonsbury, C. . }	Somerset .	James Bush . }	
Can. Resid. in Cath. }	Somerset .	Archd. Law . .	Dn. and Ch. of Wells.
Church of Wells . }			
Nettlecombe, R. . .	Somerset .	W. C. Trevelyan	Sir J. Trevelyan, Bt.
Pawlett, V.	Somerset .	J. D. O. Crosse	Lord Chancellor.
Stoke Lane, P. C. . .	Somerset .	James White .	V. of Doulting.
Bristol.			
Dorchester, Holy Tri- nity, V. and Frome }	Dorset . .	George Wood .	Corporation.
Whitefield, with Cns. }			
St. Rumbold, R. . . }			Earl of Shaftesbury.
Elberton, V. with Olveston, V. . . . }	Gloucester .	J. R. Charleton .	Abp. of Canterbury.
Minor Canonry in the Cathedral Church . }	Bristol . .	J. Warne . .	The Chapter.
Prebend in the Cath. }	Bristol . .	Sidney Smith .	Lord Chancellor.
Church }			
Winterborne, Strick- land, R. }	Dorset . .	W. Churchill, jun.	Lady C. Damer.
Chester.			
Chester, St. Olave, R.	Chester . .	Robert Yarker .	The Lord Bishop.
Deanery of	Chester . .	Dr. H. Phillpotts	The King.
Kirklington, R. . . .	York . . .	Peter Ewart . .	Countess Ormond.
Chichester.			
Brighton New Church	Sussex . .	T. Cooke . . .	V. of Brighton.
Westfield, V.*	Sussex . .	Tho. Birch, LL.D.	The Lord Bishop.
Wyke Rumbold, V. . .	Sussex . .	Thomas Watkins	Dean of Chichester.
Ely.			
Abington, Little, V. .	Cambridge	Charles Townley	{ Mrs. Pern. Master and Fellows of Jesus College, Camb. The Lord Bishop.
Gravelly, R.	Cambridge	John Warren . }	
Swaffham Bulbeck, V.	Cambridge	Leonard Jenyns	
Exeter.			
Bow Tracey, R. . . .	Devon . .	J. Rowe . . .	— Marshall, Esq.
Landwednach, R. and }	Cornwall .	H. T. Coulson .	J. Stevens, Esq.
Ruan Major, R. . }			

* To hold with Deanery of Battle.

Preferment.	County.	Preferred.	Patron.
Gloucester.			
Dyrham, <i>R.</i>	Gloucester	W. S. Robinson	W. Blaithwayte, Esq.
Swell, Upper, <i>R.</i> . . .	Gloucester	W. B. Pole . . .	C. Pole, Esq.
Lich. & Coventry.			
Archdeaconry of . . .	Salop . . .	Edward Bather .	The Lord Bishop.
Barlborough, <i>R.</i> . . .	Derby . . .	Martin Stapylton	C. H. Rhodes, Esq.
High Offley, <i>V.</i> . . .	Stafford . .	H. Dudley Ryder	The Lord Bishop.
Shrewsbury, St. Mary, } P. C. }	Salop . . .	W. G. Rowland }	Mayor, &c. of Shrews- bury.
Lincoln.			
Archdeaconry of . . .	Huntingdon	{ Dr. J. B. Hol- } { lingworth . }	The Lord Bishop.
Barrow-upon-Hum- } ber, <i>V.</i> }	Lincoln . .	G. G. Egremont	The Lord Chancellor.
Buslingthorpe, <i>R.</i> . .	Lincoln . .	J. Hale . . . }	Governors of the Char- ter House.
Luton, <i>V.</i>	Bedford . .	Wm. M'Dowall	Marquis of Bute.
Wistow, <i>V.*</i>	Hunts . . .	Ger. Mingaye .	E. Palmer, Esq.
Woodhall, <i>V.</i>	Lincoln . .	Edward Walter .	The Lord Bishop.
Llandaff.			
Llancarvan, <i>V.</i>	Glamorgan	Rees Howell . .	Lord Chancellor.
Norwich.			
Capel, St. Mary, <i>R.</i> } with Wenham, Lit- } tle, <i>R.</i> }	Suffolk . . .	Joseph Tweed .	On his own Petition.
Clay-next-the-Sea, <i>R.</i> .	Norfolk . .	Charles Collyer	J. W. Tomlinson, Esq.
Ingoldesthorpe, <i>R.</i> . .	Norfolk . .	Lovick Cooper .	On his own Petition.
Needham Market, <i>C.</i> .	Suffolk . . .	Alexander Paske	R. of Barking.
Oxford.			
Oxford, St. Mary, <i>V.</i> .	Oxford . . .	J. H. Newman }	Provost, Fellows and Scholars of Oriel College.
Peterborough.			
Arthingworth, <i>R.</i> . . .	Northampton	Wm. Wilson . .	L. Rokeby, Esq.
Blakesley, <i>V.</i>	Northampton	Geo. Sivewright .	The King.
Wakerley, <i>R.</i>	Northampton	Robert Decker .	Marquis of Exeter.
Yelvertoft, <i>R.</i>	Northampton	J. Johnson Hodson	Earl of Craven.

* With Kennett, *R.* in *Dioc. of Norwich.*

Preferment.	County.	Preferred.	Patron.
Rochester.			
Wateringbury, <i>V.</i> . .	Kent . .	Hon. J. Marsham {	Dean and Chapter of Rochester.
Salisbury.			
Inkpen, <i>R.</i> * . . .	Berks . .	Dr. T. Shephard	John Butler, Esq.
Prebend of Gillingham } Minor in the Cath. Church . . . }	Wilts . .	Thomas Tyrwhitt	The Lord Bishop.
Preb. of Ruscombe } Southbury in the Cath. Church . . }	Wilts . .	Aug. Montgomery	The Lord Bishop.
Tockenham, <i>R.</i> . . .	Wilts . .	T. Hyde Ripley	The King.
Wanborough, <i>V.</i> . .	Wilts . .	Las. Iremonger {	Dean and Chapter of Winchester.
St. Asaph.			
Penegoes, <i>R.</i> . . .	Montgomery	Tho. L. Hughes	The Lord Bishop.
Rhuddlan, <i>V. and</i> } Vicarship in Cath. Ch. }	Flint . .	T. W. Edwardes	The Lord Bishop.
St. David's.			
Freystrop, <i>R.</i> . . .	Carmarthen	Hugh G. Evans	Lord Chancellor.
Llangeler, <i>V.</i> . . .	Pembroke .	Wm. Hildyard .	Lord Chancellor.
Worcester.			
Deanery of	Worcester .	Dr. G. Murray .	The King.
Hampton, <i>P. C.</i> . . .	Worcester .	J. P. Roberts .	The Dean & Chapter.
Leigh, <i>R.</i>	Worcester .	Henry S. Cocks	Earl Somers.
Norton juxta Kempsey, <i>P. C.</i> . . . }	Worcester .	Henry Faulkner	The Dean & Chapter.
Stone, <i>V.</i>	Worcester .	John Peel . .	The Lord Chancellor.
Welland, <i>V. with</i> } Eldersfield, <i>R.</i> . . }	Worcester .	A. B. Lechmere {	The Lord Chancellor. — Lechmere, Esq.

* With Cruxeaston, *R. Hants.*

CHAPLAINCIES.

Joseph Bockett, to the Lord Bishop of Rochester.

Wm. Cotton Risley, to the Right Hon. Lord Carteret.

Henry Worsley, to the Duke of Hamilton and Brandon.

G. Hammond, to the Earl of Guilford.

James Aspinall, to Lord Clonbrock.

W. O. Bartlett, to Earl Gower.

Peter Maurice, to New College, Oxford.

George Harvey Vachell, to the East India Company's Factory at China.

ORDAINED.**BATH AND WELLS.**

By the Lord Bishop, in the Cathedral,
Sunday, December 23.

DEACONS.

Edward N. Braddon, B. A. St. John's
College, Cambridge.

R. L. Hooper, B. A. St. John's Col-
lege, Cambridge.

Henry Moseley, B. A. St. John's Col-
lege, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

J. Henshaw Gregg, B. A. St. John's
College, Cambridge.

Thomas Marriot, B. A. Christ College,
Cambridge.

Caleb Rochett, B. A. St. Peter's Col-
lege, Cambridge.

GLOUCESTER.**PRIVATE ORDINATION.**

At the Palace, by the Lord Bishop,
January 25.

DEACONS.

Robert Eden, B. A. Christ Church,
Oxford.

Richard A. Templeman, LL.D. Trinity
College, Cambridge.

PRIEST.

William Scott Robinson, B. A. Exeter
College, Oxford.

LINCOLN.

By the Lord Bishop, in Christ College
Chapel, Cambridge, Sunday, Dec. 23.

DEACONS.

John Foster Alleyne, B.A. Balliol Col-
lege, Oxford.

Samuel Boydell Beckwith, B. A. St.
John's College, Oxford.

Norris Cogswell, B.A. St. John's Col-
lege, Cambridge.

Thomas Darby, B. A. Downing Col-
lege, Cambridge.

Septimus Dawes, B. A. Caius College,
Cambridge.

Robert Drummond, B.A. Trinity Col-
lege, Cambridge.

Field Flowers, B. A. Lincoln College,
Oxford.

George Lea, B. A. Wadham College,
Oxford.

William Paull, B. A. St. John's Col-
lege, Cambridge.

William Christopher Purton, B. A. Sid-
ney College, Cambridge.

Francis De Soyres, B. A. Merton Col-
lege, Oxford.

Richard Stainforth, B.A. Queen's Col-
lege, Cambridge.

William Henry Edward Tighe, B. A.
Trinity College, Cambridge.

George James Cubitt, B.A. Caius Col-
lege, Cambridge.

Arthur Hanbury, B.A. Trinity College,
Cambridge.

Samuel Stone, B. A. Caius College,
Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

George Maurice Drummond, B. A.
Balliol College, Oxford.

Richard Andrew, M. A. Trinity Col-
lege, Cambridge.

Henry Cope, B.A. Fellow of Caius Col-
lege, Cambridge.

Samuel Crowther, B. A. Clare Hall,
Cambridge.

Charles Dade, B. A. Fellow of Caius
College, Cambridge.

Joshua Frederick Denham, B. A. St.
John's College, Cambridge.

Wm. Jennings Hamilton, B.A. Pem-
broke College, Cambridge.

Thyre Townsend Smith, B.A. Queen's
College, Cambridge.

Mar. 2.**DEACONS.**

Benjamin W. Beatson, B. A. Fellow of
Pembroke College.

Henry Albert Browne, B. A. Queen's
College, Oxford.

John Cordeaux, Catherine Hall, Cam-
bridge.

George J. Assheton Drake, B. A. St.
John's College, Cambridge.

Frederick Field, M. A. Fellow of Tri-
nity College, Cambridge.

Henry Freeman, B. A. Wadham Col-
lege, Oxford.

James Hale, B. A. Sidney College,
Cambridge.

George Adolphus Hopkins, B. A. St.
John's College, Cambridge.

William James John Leach, B.A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

William Henry M'Alpine, B.A. Trinity College, Dublin.

Tho. Joyce Whittington, B.A. Queen's College, Cambridge.

John Wordsworth, B.A. New College, Oxford.

Francis Duncan Gilly, B.A. Clare Hall, Cambridge.

From the Archbishop of York.

Thomas Dix, B.A. Christ Church, Oxford.

From the Bishop of Norwich.

John Sanders, B.A. Queen's College.

From the Bishop of Winchester.

PRIESTS.

Geo. Frederick Althorp, B.A. Emanuel College, Cambridge.

John Blissard, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Frederick George Burnaby, B.A. Caius College, Cambridge.

Charles De la Cour, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

William Grice, B.A. Queen's College, Cambridge.

John Griffiths Lloyd, B.A. Christ College, Cambridge.

George Davies Kent, M.A. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

Hompesch Massingherd, B.A. Downing College, Cambridge.

Woolley Spencer, B.A. Christ College, Cambridge.

Connop Thirlwall, M.A. Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Henry Thorpe, B.A. St. John's College, Oxford.

PETERBOROUGH.

By the Lord Bishop, in the Cathedral, Sunday, December 23.

DEACON.

Thomas Peech Holdich, B.A. Balliol College, Oxford.

PRIESTS.

Miles Joseph Berkeley, B.A. Christ College, Cambridge.

Charles William Chalklen, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

John Henry Fludver, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

John Law, B.A. Queen's College, Cambridge.

SALISBURY.

By the Lord Bishop, in the Chapel at the Palace, on Sunday, March 2.

DEACONS.

Rob. David Cartwright, B.A. Queen's College, Oxford.

Philip Poore, B.A. Queen's College, Oxford.

Charles Joseph Furlong, B.A. Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

Anthony Crowdy, M.A. Brasenose College, Oxford.

Thomas Penruddocke, B.A. Wadham College, Oxford.

John Ashfordby Trenchard, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

William Nixon Hooper, M.A. Corpus Christi College.

Thomas Husband, B.A. Magdalen College, Cambridge.

WORCESTER.

In the Chapel of Hartlebury Castle, January 25.

DEACONS.

Hon. Arthur Chetwynd Talbot, B.A. Fellow of All Saints' College, Oxford.

Capel Molyneux, B.A. Christ College, Cambridge.

Abel Smith, B.A. Christ College, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

Henry Somers Cocks, M.A. Christ Church, Oxford.

Charles Tayler, B.A. Downing College, Cambridge.

Thomas Hill, B.A. Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

DECEASED.

The Right Rev. ALEXANDER ARBUTHNOT, D.D. Lord Bishop of KILLALOE and KILFENORA.

Preferment.	County.	Deceased.	Patron.
Canterbury.			
Buckland, R. and } Medley, R. . . . }	Kent . .	J. Jenner . . }	J. Unwin, Esq. . . J. Unwin and E. Eve, Esqrs. alternately.
Leysdown, V. . . .	Kent . .	Edward Edwards	His Grace the Archbp.
Prebend in the Cathed- } ral Church . . . }	Kent . .	Dr. M. Marlow	The King.
York.			
Cave, South, V. . . .	York . .	Edw. W. Barnard	Rev. F. W. Barnard.
Ottrington, South, R. . .	York . .	J. Sampson . .	T. Bramby, Esq.
Skelton, R.	York . .	Thomas Place .	Mr. Hepworth.
Teversall, R.	Notts. . .	Wm. Rawlins .	T. Bury, Esq.
London.			
Braxted, Great, R. . .	Essex . .	Job M. Wallace	Christ. Coll. Camb.
Chingford, R.	Essex . .	Robert Lewis .	W. Heathcote.
Laver Marney, R. . .	Essex . .	F. Corsellis . .	N. Corsellis, Esq.
Minor Canonry in Ca- } thedral Church of . }	Westminster	John Shelton . }	Dean & Ch. of West- minster.
Newport, V.	Essex . .	T. Bell	The King.
Steeple, V.	Essex . .	Henry Van Voorst	E. Fowler, Esq.
Durham.			
Bywell, St. Andrew, V. }	Northumb. .	Henry Johnson }	W. Fenwick, Esq. . Dn. & Ch. of Durham.
St. Peter, V. }	Durham .	Christ. Anstey .	Bishop of Durham.
Norton, V.			
Winchester.			
Farley, R.	Surry . .	Rich. Lowndes .	Merton Coll. Oxon.
Godshall, V. Isle of }	Hants . .	John Barwis .	Queen's Coll. Oxford.
Wight, and Viton, R. }	Bucks . .	Edward Shaw .	D. & Can. of Windsor.
Wantage, V.			
Bristol.			
Prebend in Cathedral } Church }	Bristol . }	Francis Simpson	Lord Chancellor. University Coll. Oxon.
Tarrant Gunville, R. .	Dorset . }		

Preferment.	County.	Deceased.	Patron.
Chester.			
Birkby, R. } Pec. and Exempt. }	York . .	M. Partington .	The Lord Bishop.
Kirklington, R. . . .	York . .	Thomas Place .	Countess Ormond.
Sandbach, V.	Chester . .	R. L. Salmon .	R. L. Salmon.
Ely.			
Abington, Little, V. . .	Cambridge	George Barlow .	Mrs. Pern.
Caldecott, V. }	Cambridge	John Preston .	Christ Coll. Camb.
Toft, R. }	Cambridge	Richard Lowndes	Merton Coll. Oxford.
Gamlingay, R.			
Exeter.			
Belston, R.	Devon . .	W. Hall . . .	
Feniton, R.	Devon . .	J. Rogers . . .	W. Holt, Esq.
Framington, V.	Devon . .	Edw. F. May .	Rev. S. T. May.
Landewednac, R. and }			
Ruan Major, R. . . }	Cornwall .	J. N. Stevens .	J. Stevens, Esq.
Probus, V.	Cornwall .	J. Williams . .	The Lord Bishop.
Stoke Damerel, R. . .	Devon . .	T. Williamson .	Sir J. St. Aubyn, Bt.
Gloucester.			
Child's Wickham, R. . .	Gloucester .	John Shelton .	Sir H. Dashwood, Bt.
Pebworth, V.	Gloucester .	Edw. Edwards .	Marq. of Salisbury.
Hereford.			
Abberley, R. and }			
Kyre Magna, R. . . }	Worcester .	Francis Severne }	R. Bromley, Esq.
Aston, C. }			E. Pitts, Esq.
Radnor, New, R. . . }	Hereford .	Tho. Hodges }	S. Davies, Esq.
			The King.
Lich. & Coventry.			
Archdeacon of			
Prebend of Bishops-			
hull, in the Cath. }	Salop . .	Hugh Owen . .	The Lord Bishop.
Church }			Earl of Tankerville.
Shrewsbury, St. Julian, }			
P. C. }			
Stanton-by-the-			
Bridge, R. and }	Derby . .	George Graves }	Sir H. Harpur, Bart.
Swarkstone, R. . . }			Sir H. Crewe, Bart.
Lincoln.			
Archdeaconry of . . .	Huntingdon	James Hook . .	The Lord Bishop.
Barrow-upon-Soar, V.	Lincoln . .	E. H. Hesledon .	Lord Chancellor.
Sandon, V.	Herts . .	Job M. Wallace .	Dn. & Ch. of St. Paul's.
Warboys, R. and }	Hunts . .	Robert Fowler . }	W. Strode, Esq.
Langton, R. }	Lincoln . .		The Lord Bishop.
Vicar Choral in Cath. }			
Church of }	Lincoln . .	Samuel Martin .	The Lord Bishop.

Preferment.	County.	Deceased.	Patron.
Norwich.			
Capel, St. Mary, R. } with Wenham Parra, } R. & Hintlesham, R. } Wickhambrook, V. .	Suffolk . .	Joseph Tweed } George Pyke .	R. Powell, Esq. W. Deane, Esq. Lord Chancellor.
Oxford.			
Bampton, V. . . .	Oxford . .	Hugh Owen . .	Dn. & Ch. of Exeter.
Handborough, V. . .	Oxford . .	Dr. M. Marlow	St. John's Coll. Oxford.
President of St. John's } College }	Oxford . .	Dr. M. Marlow	St. John's Coll. Oxford.
Tackley, R.	Oxford . .	Wm. Morice . .	St. John's Coll. Oxford.
Peterborough.			
Rothwell, V.	Northampt.	P. S. Criche . .	Rev. W. Higginson.
Stoke Bruern, R. . .	Northampt.	Wm. Stalman .	Brasenose Coll. Oxon.
Salisbury.			
Canon of Windsor . .	Berks . .	E. Northey . .	D. & Can. of Windsor.
Frilsham, R.	Berks . .	Robert Baker .	Mr. Hayward.
Preb. of Gillingham } Minor in Cathedral } Church }	Wilts . .	Hugh Owen . .	The Lord Bishop.
Preb. of Ruscomb in } Cathedral Church }	Wilts . .	John H. Jacob .	The Lord Bishop.
Steeple Ashton, V. and } Semington, Chap. . }	Wilts . .	Samuel Hey . .	Magdalen Coll. Camb.
St. David's.			
Freystrop, R.	Pembroke .	Cha. Powell . .	Lord Chancellor.
Worcester.			
Deanery in the Cathed- } ral Church of } Bromsgrove, V. and } Stone, V. }	Worcester .	James Hook . .	The King. D. & C. of Worcester. Lord Chancellor.
Norton, V. with } Lenchwick, P. C. }	Worcester .	W. Wormington	Dn. & Ch. of Worcester.
Welland, V.	Worcester .	Henry Boulter .	Lord Chancellor.
Kyre, R.	Worcester .	F. Severe . . .	Mr. Pytts.

Name.	Residence.	County.
Edward Henry Hesledon	Barrow near Barton	Lincolnshire.
John Hutton	Rolvenden	Kent.
Robert Eyton	Cannington	Somerset.
R. Cottam	St. John's Swansea, Lect.	Glamorgan.
S. Starkey	Wootton Bassett	Wilts.
William Moody	West Bromwich	Staffordshire.
John Barnet	St. Nicholas, Newcastle, Curacy . . .	Northumberland.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Residence.</i>	<i>County.</i>
David Davies	Macclesfield School	Chester.
Martin Wiseman	Wennington, <i>Curacy</i>	Essex.
George Bailey	Wake's Colne	Essex.
George Coleridge	Ottery St. Mary	Devon.
G. Elliott Ranken	Clifton	Somerset.
John Sydenham	Cullumpton	Devon.
J. H. Bricknell	Oldham	Hants.
John Addison Carr, jun....	Hadstock	Essex.
Henry Fothergill	Castlemorton, <i>Curacy</i>	Worcester.
William Owen	Gravesend, <i>Curacy</i>	Kent.
Bache Thornhill	Stanton	Derby.
G. Browne Maturin	Fellow of King's College	Cambridge.
John Cantis	Fellow of Christ's College	Cambridge.

MARRIED.

The Rev. Richard Leonard Adams, M.A. Student of Christ Church, Oxford, to the Hon. E. A. Powys, fourth daughter of the late Lord Lilford.

In Dublin, the Rev. G. Lowther Irvine, Rector of Dunshaughlin and Rathbegan, County of Meath, to Florence Henrietta, daughter of C. S. J. Nugent, Esq. of Bobs Grove.

The Rev. F. Owen, of Rathdrum, County of Wicklow, to Miss Francis D'Alton.

The Rev. Francis Bryans, M. A. of St. Edmund Hall and of Farndon in Chester, to Sarah Clough, only child of the late R. C. Bury, Esq.

At St. James's, Clerkenwell, the Rev. Leonard Fletcher, B.A. of All Souls' College, Oxford, to Miss Amy Irons.

At Liverpool, the Rev. Charles Shaw Bursham, Vicar of Little Budworth, Cheshire, to Miss Mary Tabitha Jones, of Bream's Buildings, Chancery Lane, London.

At Irvine, the Rev. Charles Bannatyne Slevin, Minister of Slewarton, to Miss Marianne Fullarton, of Fullarton.

At Kingston, Oxfordshire, the Rev. D. H. Hammond, Rector of Whitchurch, Oxfordshire, to Miss Maria Brown.

The Rev. J. B. Webb, Vicar of Wcohly and King's Pyon, Herefordshire, to Miss Annie Molyneux, of Gravel Hill, near Ludlow.

At the Cape of Good Hope, the Rev. B. C. Goodison, M.A. Chaplain to His Majesty's Forces, to Miss Ellen Horne, of the same place.

The Rev. Alexander Macdonald, of King's Cliffe, Northamptonshire, to Mrs. William Jackson of the former place.

The Rev. Edward Woodhouse, M.A.

of Pembroke College, Oxford, to Catherine Anne, only daughter of the late Alderman Christopher Smith, M.P. of Starborough Castle, Surrey.

The Rev. John Chancourt Girardot, Rector of Screveton, to Georgiana, second daughter of the Rev. Robert Chaplin.

At Bromyard, the Rev. G. Woodhouse, Vicar of Leominster, to Anne Sophia, daughter of the late Sir John Ditton Coll, Bt.

The Rev. Henry Owen, B.A. of Holme Parsonage, to Louisa Longe, only daughter of John Sutter, Esq. of Stourmarket.

The Rev. C. E. Twyford, Rector of Sutton, Sussex, to Georgiana, youngest daughter of the late George Purvis, Esq. of Blackwood House, Hants.

At Derby, the Rev. Charles Hesketh, B.A. of Trinity College, and of Rossall Hall, in the County of Lancaster, to Anna Maria Alice, only daughter of R. Saunders, Esq.

The Rev. F. J. C. Trenon, M.A. Rector of Langton Herring, near Weymouth, to Mrs. Hannah Baker, of Berkeley Square, Bristol.

The Rev. J. S. Hewett, D.D. Rector of Rotherhithe, and Enshur, Sussex, to Marianne, eldest daughter of the Rev. S. Nele.

The Rev. W. Atkinson, M.A. Vicar of Canewdon, Essex, to Miss Kersteman, of Loftmans.

The Rev. Thomas Dixon, Vicar of Tokenham, Norfolk, to Mrs. C. Smyth.

The Rev. J. Delafield to the Lady Cecil Jane Pery, fifth daughter of the Earl of Limerick.

The Rev. Douglas Hodgson, Rector of East Woodhay, Hants, to Sarah, eldest daughter of the Rev. H. Rice.

PROCEEDINGS
OF
THE UNIVERSITIES

OXFORD.

DEGREES CONFERRED FROM JANUARY TO MARCH, INCLUSIVE.

BACHELOR AND DOCTOR IN DIVINITY
(*by accumulation*).

Jan. 24.

Rev. Charles Tapp Griffiths, Wadham College, Master of Warminster School.

Feb. 28.

The Rev. John Worrall Grove, St. Edmund Hall.

DOCTOR IN DIVINITY.

Feb. 2.

Edward Hawkins, Provost of Oriel College.

DOCTOR IN CIVIL LAW.

Jan. 24.

Rev. Frederick Nolan, Exeter College.

Mar. 14.

Philip Wynter, President of St. John's College.

BACHELOR IN DIVINITY.

Mar. 13.

Rev. William Jackson, Fellow of Queen's College.

BACHELOR IN CIVIL LAW.

Jan. 22.

Rev. Frederick Nolan, Exeter College.

DOCTOR IN MEDICINE.

Jan. 24.

Geo. Hamilton Neve, Magdalen Hall, (incorporated from Trinity College, Dublin.)

MASTERS OF ARTS.

Jan. 14.

Rev. William Hazel, Christ Church.
William Cradock Hall, Queen's College.

Jan. 24.

Rev. Cha. Backhouse Sowerby, University College, Grand Compounder.

Henry Erskine Head, St. Mary Hall.

Rev. George W. Woodhouse, St. Mary Hall.

Joseph Neate Walsh, St. John's College.

Jan. 29.

Hon. and Rev. Rich. Fitzgerald King, St. Mary Hall, Grand Compounder.

Rev. Thomas Hughes, Jesus College.

Rev. John Bond, Wadham College.

John Hill, Brasenose College.

Rev. John Lewis Capper, Pembroke College.

Rev. George Jeans, Pembroke College.

Feb. 2.

Rev. John Peel, Christ Church, Grand Compounder.

Rev. Charles Augustus Thurlow, Balliol College.

Henry Browne, Lincoln College.

Feb. 14.

Rev. Frederick Alexander Sterky, Student of Christ Church.

Feb. 28.

C. Denham Orlando Jephson, Brasenose College, Grand Compounder.

William Hodgson, Wadham College, Grand Compounder.

Rev. John Cox, St. Mary Hall.

Jonathan Bleuman Cobham, Oriel College.

Mar. 6.

Robert William Mackay, Brasenose College, Grand Compounder.

Rev. Henry Dudley Ryder, Oriel College, Grand Compounder.

William Mutton Blencowe, Oriel College.

Charles Collyns Walker, Scholar of Worcester College.

Rev. Percy William Powlett, Michel Fellow of Queen's College.

Mar. 13.

Rev. Henry Currer Wilson, Lincoln College.

Mar. 22.

Rev. Humphrey Pountney, Queen's College.

Rev. Joseph Spry, Magdalen Hall.

Rev. Thomas Hope, University College.

Rev. Aaron Rogers, Jesus College.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

Jan. 14.

Frederick Russell, St. Mary Hall.

John Griffith, Jesus College.

George Marsham, Christ Church.

Richard Lane Freer, Christ Church.

Thomas Dix, Christ Church.

John Duffus, Queen's College.

John Saunders, Queen's College.

Joseph Braithwaite, Queen's College.

Fletcher Woodhouse, Queen's College.

Henry Holdsworth, Brasenose College.

John Kershaw Craig, Magdalen Hall.

Jan. 24.

Doug. Smith, Student of Christ Church.

Walter L. Brown, Student of Christ Church.

Hen. Sanders, Student of Christ Church.

Richard Seymour, Student of Christ Church.

Francis E. Paget, Student of Christ Church.

Phillip Henry Nind, Christ Church.

Hon. Frederick C. Amherst, Christ Church.

John Ryle Wood, Christ Church.

James Cox, Christ Church.

John G. Griffith, Fellow of St. John's College.

Frederick Maude, Brasenose College.

Horatio Nelson Goddard, Brasenose College.

George Leigh, Brasenose College.

John Page Read, Exeter College.

Jan. 29.

James Tanner, Queen's College.

The Right Hon. the Lord Viscount Holmesdale, Christ Church.

Hen. Spencer Markham, Christ Church.
Henry Paget Aldenburg Bentinck, Christ Church.

S. Ralph Cartwright, Christ Church.

Thomas Littleton Wheeler, Scholar of Worcester College.

William Millner, Worcester College.

Robert John Gould, St. Alban Hall.

Thomas J. Birch, Brasenose College.

George Roots, Brasenose College.

Henry Vincent Shortland, Lord Crewe's Exhibitioner, Lincoln College.

Edward Parris Smith, Pembroke College.

Nathaniel Goldsmid, Exeter College.

Feb. 2.

E. Osborne, Oriel College, Grand Compounder.

William Severne, Queen's College.

Courtney J. C. Bulteel, Balliol College.

James Vaughan, Balliol College.

Tho. Dundas Spiers, University College.

William Henry Griffith, Jesus College.

Thomas Cæsar Owen, Jesus College.

William Parker Parry, Wadham College.

Arthur Lister L. Kaye, Brasenose College.

William Arthur Price, Brasenose College.

George Barton, Brasenose College.

Charles Forster, Oriel College.

John Guard, Oriel College.

Henry Le Mesurier, New College.

Thomas Lewin, Trinity College.

Tullie Cornthwaite, Trinity College.

Feb. 14.

William Reade, Queen's College, Grand Compounder.

Henry Digby Serrell, Queen's College.

Phillip Poore, Queen's College.

George Ross, Lincoln College.

William Marriott Leir, Wadham College.

John Whalley, Brasenose College.

Hill Dawe Wickham, Exeter College.

Feb. 23.

George Bingham, Worcester College.

The Right Hon. Viscount Fitzharris, Oriel College.

Charles Neate, Scholar of Lincoln College.

Richard Spry, Wadham College.

Mar. 6.

George William Hope, Christ Church.

William Reginald Courtenay, Christ Church.

Joseph Gibbs, Worcester College.

Mar. 13.

William Doveton Philpot, Lincoln College.

Mar. 22.

John Charnock, Lincoln College.

MISCELLANEOUS UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

Dec. 24.

The following gentlemen were elected Students of Christ Church:—Messrs. W. K. Hamilton, P. H. Nind, H. Denison, G. L. Parsons, and C. Wordsworth; and at the same time, Messrs. J. Austin, J. E. Bates, E. Hill, and H. Kynaston, were admitted Students of the same Society, having been elected in May last from Westminster College.

Jan. 31.

The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Llandaff resigned the Headship of Oriel College, Jan. 29, the Rev. Edward Hawkins, M.A. Fellow of Oriel, was this day unanimously elected Provost.

The Right Hon. Robert Peel, D.C.L. of Christ Church, has been unanimously re-elected one of the Burgesses of the University in the present Parliament.

Feb. 14.

In Convocation this day, the thanks of the University were voted to the Right Hon. Charles Watkyn Williams Wynn, for the liberal mark of his attention in offering a Writership (belonging to his patronage in the Hon. East India Company's Service), as a Prize for competition among the junior members of the University; and at the same time it was agreed that his offer of the Writership be accepted.

Mr. George Cox and Mr. Thomas Broadley Fookes, have been admitted Scholars of New College.

Frederick Madden, Esq. of Magdalen Hall, has been appointed Assistant Keeper of the Manuscripts in the British Museum, in the room of the Rev. Mr. Forshall, of Exeter College, who succeeds Mr. Ellis as senior in that department.

Feb. 26.

The Rev. Philip Wynter, B.D. Fellow of St. John's College, was elected President

of that Society, in the room of the Rev. Michael Marlow, D.D. deceased.

Feb. 27.

The election of the Proctors for the ensuing year came on at the respective Colleges named in the Caroline Cycle, viz.—Merton and St. John's; and the names of the Gentlemen so elected were, according to Statute, announced to the Vice-Chancellor. They are

The Rev. William Arundell Bouverie, M.A. Fellow of Merton College.

The Rev. Charles Litchfield Swainson, M.A. Fellow of St. John's College.

Feb. 28.

The Rev. Thomas Townson Churton, M.A. Fellow of Brasenose College was nominated a Public Examiner in Literis Humanioribus.

The Rev. William Hayward Cox, M.A. of Pembroke College, and the Rev. Percy William Powlett, B.A. of Trinity College, were elected and admitted Fellows of Queen's College, on Mr. Michel's foundation.

Mar. 3.

In full Convocation it was agreed that the Statute relating to the creation of the "Generales Sophistæ" should be altered, and that, for the future, all those Gentlemen who have completed two years from the time of their Matriculation and have obtained a testimonial of having responded before the Masters of the Schools, should be accounted *General Sophists*, without going through the old ceremony of creation.

Mar. 13.

In Convocation it was agreed that humble petitions be presented to the Right Honourable the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and to the Honourable the House of Commons, praying that the Laws by which persons professing the Roman Catholic religion are precluded from holding certain offices and from sitting in Parliament, may not be repealed.

Mar. 18.

The Right Hon. Charles Watkin Williams Wynn, upon offering a Writership in the Honourable the East India Company's Service, as an object of competition to the Junior Members of the University, commissioned the Vice-Chancellor and the Dean of Christ Church, to make such arrangements as they might deem

necessary for carrying his wishes into effect. In the discharge of this trust they have given notice, that—

1. The Examination of the Candidates for this Writership will be holden in the Convocation House, and will begin on Monday, June 9, at 10 o'Clock in the Morning, and be continued on the days immediately following.

2. The subjects of Examination will be,
The Four Gospels;
Paley's Evidences;
Some of the best Greek and Latin Classics;
Ancient and Modern History, with the Geography and Chronology of each;
English Prose Composition;
The Elements of Pure Mathematics, and of Natural and Experimental Philosophy.

3. The Examiners appointed for this occasion will nominate the person to be recommended to Mr. Wynn for the Writership.

4. Each Candidate must announce his intention of offering himself, by leaving at the Vice-Chancellor's house, on or before the 29th of May next, a certificate of his birth, and a testimonium from the College or Hall to which he may belong. No person will be admitted as a Candidate who shall signify his intention after the last-mentioned day.

5. No person can be admitted as a Candidate who will have completed, on the 15th of October next, 22 years from the day of his birth.

R. JENKINS,

Vice-Chancellor.

S. SMITH,

Dean of Christ Church.

March 18.

Mar. 22.

The Rev. Joseph Dornford, M.A. a Fellow of Oriel College, was nominated a Public Examiner in Literis Humanioribus.

SUMMARY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE
UNIVERSITY, JANUARY, 1828.

	Members of Con- vocation.	Members on the Books.
1 University . . .	112 . .	213
2 Balliol . . .	92 . .	224
3 Mertou . . .	68 . .	127
4 Exeter . . .	99 . .	251
5 Oriel . . .	151 . .	295
6 Queen's . . .	153 . .	346
7 New . . .	65 . .	147
8 Lincoln . . .	55 . .	139
9 All Souls . . .	67 . .	93
10 Magdalen . . .	122 . .	167
11 Brasenose . . .	218 . .	405
12 Corpus . . .	82 . .	125
13 Christ Church . .	429 . .	854
14 Trinity . . .	96 . .	238
15 St. John's . . .	125 . .	213
16 Jesus . . .	53 . .	174
17 Wadham . . .	77 . .	191
18 Pembroke . . .	72 . .	175
19 Worcester . . .	88 . .	228
20 St. Mary Hall . .	37 . .	91
21 Magdalen Hall . .	45 . .	165
22 New Inn Hall . .	1 . .	1
23 St. Alban Hall . .	7 . .	34
24 St. Edmund Hall .	51 . .	113
	2365	5009
Matriculations . . .		397
Regents . . .		185
Determining Bachelors in Lent .		273

CAMBRIDGE.

DEGREES CONFERRED FROM OCTOBER TO DECEMBER INCLUSIVE.

BACHELORS IN DIVINITY.

Feb. 20.

James Thomas Matthews, St. John's College.

Mar. 5.

Rev. R. M. Mant, Christ College, Compounder.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

Feb. 20.

Rev. Robert Thompson, Trinity College.

Rev. Francis John Spitta, St. John's College.

Mar. 5.

William Proctor, Christ College, (*by Royal Mandate.*)

Rev. Henry Bathscombe, Fellow of King's College.

James Packe, Fellow of King's College.

John Hardy Elaren, Magdalen College.

HONORARY MASTERS OF ARTS.

Feb. 20.

Henry Fitzroy, Esq. Trinity College.

Hon. R. Le Poer Trench, St. John's College.

BACHELOR OF CIVIL LAW.

Feb. 20.

James Heseltine Bayford, Trinity Hall.

Mar. 5.

Rev. John Vaughan, St. John's Coll.

Rev. William Wogan Aldrich, Trinity Hall.

Pelham Stanhope Aldrich, Trinity Hall.

Rev. William Gunning, Christ College, Compounder.

BACHELOR IN PHYSIC.

Mar. 5.

Erasmus Darwin, Christ College.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

Feb. 20.

John Raine, Trinity College.

Hugh Wood, Trinity College.

John Mossop, St. John's College.

Frederick Arkwright, Trinity College.

Gilbert Price Jenner, Trinity College.

Edmund Henry Outram, St. John's Coll.

T. N. Noel Hill, St. John's College.

William Moore, St. John's College.

Thomas Halsted, Trinity Hall.

William Henry Smith, Queen's College.

Mar. 5.

John Robert Fiske, Catharine Hall.

John Bennett Goodwin, Sidney Sussex College.

William Morshead, Sidney Sussex Coll.

BACHELORS' COMMENCEMENT, *January 19, 1828.*

Those gentlemen whose names are preceded by an asterisk have one or more terms to keep previous to being ADMITTED to their degrees, although they passed their examination in the following order of arrangement.

WRANGLERS.

Perry, Trin.	Smith, Cai.	Peile, Trin.	Potter, Pet.
Baily, Joh.	Gratrix, Joh.	Dusautoy, Qu.	Fawcett, Trin.
Evans, Joh.	Goodwin, C.C.C.	Spedding, Cai.	Almack, Joh.
Lund, Joh.	Scaplehorn, C.C.C.	Wicheote, Joh.	Borlase, Trin.
Overton, Joh.	Fitzherbert, Trin.	Briggs, Cai.	Cockayne, Joh.
Selwyn, Joh.	Lestourgeon, Trin.	Sheffield, Qu.	Jones, Magd.
Snowball, Joh.	Stokes, Cai.	Smith, Cath.	Swann, Joh.
C. Smith, Joh.	Coddington, Trin.	Robinson, Trin.	Atherton, Qu.
Tuck, Emm.			

SENIOR OPTIMES.

Hall, } Cai.	Kerrison, C.C.C.	Willis, Trin.	Gunton, Chr.
Haymes, } <i>Hq.</i> Clare	Jones, C.C.C.	Maynard, Cai.	Wace, Trin.
Cockburn, Sid.	Bentall, Trin.	Bateman, Qu.	Barker, C.C.C.
Dickson, Emm.	Cotterill, Qu.	Bower, Jes.	Jerrard, } Cai.
Dodd, Mag.	Gillies, Cai.	Todd, Cai.	Whittington, } Qu.
*Raine, Trin.	Docker, Chr.	Collin, Emm.	Platt, Trin.
Morton, Sid.	Barnes, Trin.	Simpson, C.C.C.	Maclaren, Trin.
Cookesley, Joh.	Burrow, Qu.		

JUNIOR OPTIMES.

Appleton, Joh.	Houghton, C.C.C.	Thornton, C.C.C.	Brockman, Trin.
Blake, Pet.	Knight, Trin.	Dugard, } Joh.	Ashforth, Trin.
Brown, Trin.	Hankinson } C.C.C.	Page, } Emm.	Ford, Joh.
Yardley, Joh.	Povah, } Trin.	Baxter, Joh.	Procter, Pemb.
Gibson, C.C.C.	Reynard, Jes.	Brayshaw, Joh.	Tate, Trin.
Snow, Joh.	Atkinson, Magd.	*Ogilby, Trin.	*Cook, Joh.
Kingdon, Trin.	*Goodwin, Sid.	Rigg, Pet.	

ÆGROTAT.—Borton, Cath. | Watson, Joh.

Mickleburgh, Trin. — Cottrell, Pemb.

Gore, Emm.	*Neville, } Trin.	*Fisher, Joh.	Haden, C.C.C.
Staunton, Chr.	*Cordeaux, } Cath.	Whittington, Clare	Roe, Cath.
Dixon, Cath.	Gorle, Clare	Haslegrave, Cath.	*Hanham, Pet.
*Ingham, Trin.	Key, Cath.	Onslow, Qu.	Waite, Clare
*Williams, Qu.	Walpole, Trin.	James, Joh.	Grisdale, } Emm.
*Bennett, Qu.	Hodges, Qu.	Harrison, Qu.	Rowe, } C.C.C.
Harvey, Qu.	Turner, sen. Pemb.	*Arkwright, } Trin.	Money, Trin.
*Williams, Cath.	*Hiscock, Qu.	*Robinson, } Trin.	Weybridge, Joh.
Hastings, Trin.	*Cree, Trin.	Watkins, Qu.	Palmer, Trin.
Fisher, Clare	Barker, Trin.	Otter, Pet.	Stringer, Chr.
Romilly, Chr.	*E. Perry, Trin.	Williams, Chr.	*Annand, Jes.
Barrett, Pemb.	*Baker, Joh.	Andrews, Jes.	Dunn, } Qu.
Kelk, sen. Jes.	Picton, Qu.	Bull, Qu.	Lewis, } Joh.
Harrison, Trin.	Handley, Trin.	Simpson, Trin.	Welby, } Chr.
Cooper, Pemb.	*Foster, Emm.	*Hope, Trin.	*Macdonald, Cai.
Maynard, Cai.	Thompson, Trin.	*Charriere, Chr.	Frobisher, Trin.
Fraser, Qu.	Hogg, } C.C.C.	Stone, Trin.	Sanford, Trin.
Boissier, Magd.	Sheard, } Sid.	Monck, Trin.	*Trench, Joh.
*Clarke, Qu.	Roby, Emm.	Manning, Cath.	Bedford, Clare
Harden, } Joh.	*Ld. C. Wellesley, Tr.	Wordsworth, Trin.	*Rowland, Magd.
Morgan, } Cai.	Kinchant, Qu.	Bradford, Magd.	Mathews, } Joh.
Payley, Joh.	*Bond, Trin.	*Morshead, Sid.	Neale, } Emm.
Wrangham, Magd.	*Leeke, Qu.	*R. Bird, Magd.	Drosier, Sid.
Bland, Cai.	*Davis, } Tr. H.	Lacon, Emm.	Graham, C.C.C.
Ingham, Qu.	*Davis, } Trin.	Ashford, Trin.	Chamness, Trin.
Jeffery, Pemb.	Layton, Pet.	Eyre, Chr.	Carson, Pet.
Feilden, Joh.	Beckett, Joh.	Victor, Clare	*Wood, Trin.
Marriott, Trin.	*Tuckett, Joh.	Astley, C.C.C.	Olive, C.C.C.
Hopkins, Joh.	*Chapman, Joh.	Beebee, Joh.	White, Emm.
*Chapman, Chr.	Broughton, Emma.	Turner, jun. Pemb.	Bowerbank, Joh.
Robinson, Joh.	Heslridge, Qu.	Becher, Joh.	*Eustace, Trin.
Hall, Trin.	Corbett, } Trin.	Wrench, C.C.C.	Dawson, jun. Joh.
*Langdon, Qu.	*Jones, } Trin.	*Robertson, Chr.	Spencer, Joh.
Page, C.C.C.	Parr, } Joh.	*Nugent, Trin.	Douglas, Joh.
Webb, Trin.	Dalton, } Mag.	Langshaw, Joh.	*Le Mann, Trin.
*Bridge, Qu.	*Fitzmaurice, } Joh.	Waller, Trin.	Dashwood, Qu.
Bolden, Trin.	James, Chr.	Bratt, Trin.	Sampson, Jes.
Holland, } Qu.	Buller, Trin.	Dolphin, Trin.	James, Trin.
Wybrew, } Joh.	*Gorton, } Tr.	Johnson, Qu.	Webber, Joh.
Rawlinson, Trin.	Dawson, sen. } Joh.	Marriner, Trin.	Ilderton, Trin.
Robinson, Cath.	*Coleman, } Chr.	Rouppell, Trin.	Kyd, Emm.
Lee, Trin.	*Maltby, } Pct.	Yonge, Jes.	Lowry, Clare
*Hayes, Trin.	Gilpin, Chr.	Nicholson, Jes.	Frere, Trin.
Tucker, Qu.	Lawson, Trin.	*Packer, Cath.	Notridge, Pemb.
Wedgwood, Trin.	T. H. Bird, Magd.	*Goring, Sid.	*Rotton, Trin.
*Clay, Joh.	Spencer, Trin.	*Smith, Qu.	
*Saunders, Joh.	Baylay, Trin.	*Fawcett, Joh.	Askew, Emm.
*Coghlan, Qu.	Peel, Joh.	Matthias, C.C.C.	*Brookes, Pet.
Bourne, Emm.	Griffith, Qu.	Tyrwhitt, Jes.	Kelk, jun. Jes.
	Shore, Sid.	Young, Trin.	*Wake, Trin.

ÆGROTAT.

Graham, Qu. | Michell, Tr. H. | Pooley, Jes. | Tharp, Chr.

COMBINATION PAPER, 1828.

PRIOR COMB.

- Jan. 6. Coll. Trin.
13. Coll. Joh.
20. Mr. Woolnough, Chr.
27. Mr. Marshall, Regin.
- Feb. 3. Mr. Heath, Clar.
10. Mr. Cobbold, Cai.
17. Coll. Regal.
24. Coll. Trin.
- Mar. 2. Coll. Joh.
9. Mr. Blackburne, Chr.
16. Mr. Norman, Cath.
23. Mr. Browne, Corp.
30. Mr. Bulwer, Jes.
- Apr. 6. FEST. PASCH.
13. Coll. Trin.
20. Coll. Joh.
27. Mr. Pooley, Chr.
- Mai. 4. Mr. Furnival, Regin.
11. Mr. Charlton, Sid.
18. Mr. Lockwood, Jes.
25. FEST. PENTEC.
- Jun. 1. Coll. Trin.
8. Coll. Joh.
15. Mr. May, Chr.
22. Mr. Jackson, Regin.
29. COMMEN. BENEF.
- Jul. 6. Mr. Stone, Sid.
13. Mr. Lafont, Emm.
20. Coll. Regal.
27. Coll. Trin.

POSTER. COMB.

- Jan. 1. FEST. CIRC. M. T. Belgrave, Joh.
6. FEST. EPIPH. Mr. Mathew, Joh.
13. Mr. G. Belgrave, Joh.
20. Mr. Edge, Joh.
25. CONV. ST. PAUL. Mr. Jenkyn, Joh.
27. Mr. Cecil, Magd.
- Feb. 2. FEST. PURIF. Mr. Crawley, Mag.
3. Mr. Vane, Magd.
10. Mr. T. M. Sutton, Trin.
17. Mr. Boys, Trin.
20. DIES CENERUM. CONCIO AD CLERUM.
24. FEST. S. MATTH. Mr. C. Musgrave, Trin.
- Mar. 2. Mr. H. V. Elliott, Trin.
9. Mr. Ingle, Pet.
16. Mr. R. Petyman, Trin.
23. Mr. Huntley, Trin.
25. FEST. { Mr. Sarel, Trin.
ANNUNC. { Mr. J. Arkwright, Trin.
30. Mr. Spence, jun. Trin.
- Apr. 4. PASSIO DOM. Mr. Hanbury, Emm.
6. FEST. PASCH. Coll. Regal.
7. Fer. 1ma. Mr. Fowell, Emm.
8. Fer. 2da. Mr. Philips, Emm.
13. Mr. Bonnett, Sid.

- Apr. 20. Mr. Poynder, Chr.
25. FEST. ST. MARC. Mr. C. S. Luxmoore, Joh.
27. Mr. Calvert, Jes.
- Mai. 1. F. SS. PHIL. ET J. Mr. Keene, Sid.
4. Mr. Geo. Waddington, Trin.
11. Mr. J. C. Franks, Trin.
15. FEST. ASCENS. { Mr. Wynch, Sid.
 { Mr. Ridsdale, Clar.
18. Mr. E. T. Bidwell, Clar.
25. FEST. PENTEC. Coll. Regal.
26. Fer. 1ma. Mr. White, Joh.
27. Fer. 2da. Mr. Ainslie, Pemb.
- Jun. 1. Mr. Abbott, Cath.
8. Mr. Goddard, Sid.
11. F. ST. BARNAB. Mr. Douglas, Joh.
15. Mr. Barrow, Joh.
22. Mr. Green, Trin.
24. FEST. NAT. JOH. BAPT. Mr. Worthington, Clar.
29. FEST. S. PET. COM. BENEFAC.
- Jul. 6. Mr. Clapham, Trin.
13. Mr. Miller, Clar.
20. Mr. Dobson, Pet.
25. FEST. S. JAC. Mr. Sparke, Jes.
27. Mr. Cheap, Trin.

RESP. IN THEOLOG.

OPPON.

- Mr. R. Smith, Trin. { Coll. Joh.
 { Mr. Hallewell, Chr.
 { Mr. Ven. Regin.
 { Mr. E. R. William-
Mr. Petteward, Trin. { son, Clar.
 { Mr. Dawson, Cai.
 { Coll. Regal.
 { Coll. Trin.
Mr. Whishaw, Trin. { Coll. Joh.
 { Mr. Ash, Chr.
 { Mr. Coldwell, Cath.
Mr. Borton, Cai. { Mr. Cape, Clar.
 { Mr. Warren, Jes.
 { Coll. Regal.
Mr. Mathew, Trin. { Coll. Trin.
 { Coll. Joh.
 { Mr. C. Smith, Pet.
Mr. Feacham, Joh. { Mr. Tyson, Cath.
 { Mr. Wilkinson, C. C.
 { Mr. Pope, Emm.
Mr. Otter, Jes. . . . { Coll. Regal.
 { Coll. Trin.

RESP. IN JUR. CIV.

OPPON.

- Mr. Hustler, Jes. { Mr. Caldwell, Jes.
 { Mr. Bennett, Emm.
Mr. Edgar, Cai. . . { Mr. North, Cai.
 { Mr. Abdy, Jes.
- RESP. IN MEDIC. ——— OPPON.
- Mr. Pinckard, Cai. { Mr. Shaw, Cai.
 { Mr. Maclean, Cai.
Mr. Roots, Jes. . . { Mr. Babington, Pem.
 { Mr. Beckes, Jes.

CLASSICAL TRIPOS, 1828.

First Class.

Ds.	Ds.
Selwyn, Joh.	Hankinson, } Corp.
Peile, } Trin.	Perry, } Trin.
Platt, } Trin.	Barney, Trin.
Cook, Joh.	Evans, Joh.
Jerrard, Caius.	Willis, Trin.
Fitzherbert, Trin.	Fawcett, Trin.

Second Class.

Ds.	Dr.
Raine, Trin.	Kingdon, Trin.
Sheffield, Ex.	Ashworth, Trin.

Third Class.

Ds.	Ds.
Tate, Trin.	Povah, Trin.
Whittington, Ex.	Yardley, Joh.
Dodd, Magd.	Brockman, Trin.
Swann, Joh.	Briggs, Caius.

Feb. 5.

The Rev. George Shephard Porter, M.A. Fellow of Christ College on the foundation of Sir John Finch and Sir Thomas Baines, has been elected a Foundation Fellow of that Society.

Feb. 6.

George Biddell Airy, Esq. M.A. Fellow of Trinity College, and Lucasian Professor of Mathematics, was unanimously elected Plumian Professor of Astronomy and Experimental Philosophy, in the room of the late Robert Woodhouse, Esq. M.A. F.R.S.

Feb. 8.

William Anthony Collins, Esq. M.A. of Christ College, has been elected a Fellow of that Society, on the foundation of Sir John Finch and Sir Thomas Baines.

Feb. 22.

William Aldwin Soames, of Trinity College, was elected University Scholar on Lord Craven's foundation.

The Master and Fellows of Jesus College have obtained from their Visitor, the Bishop of Ely, a new statute, which has been confirmed by the Crown, and which removes the present restriction with regard to the election of an equal number of Fellows from the Northern and Southern counties, and enables the Society to elect Fellows without any such restriction, from any part of England and Wales. The new statute is to take effect at the expiration of five years.

The following will be the Subjects of examination in the last week of Lent term, 1829:—

1. *The Gospel of St. Luke.*
2. *Paley's Evidences of Christianity.*
3. *The Hecuba of Euripides.*
4. *The Third Book of Cicero's Offices.*

March 5.

Charles Babbage, Esq. M.A. of Trinity College, was elected Lucasian Professor of Mathematics, vacant by the election of G. B. Airy, Esq. to the Plumian Professorship.

Graces passed the Senate to appoint Mr. Hughes, of Emmanuel College, and Mr. Ebdon, of Trinity Hall, Examiners of the Junior Sophs, in the place of Mr. Byam and Mr. Porter.

PRIZES.

HULSEAN PRIZE.

Adjudged to

Edward Young, Trinity College.

Subject:—*The Contention between Paul and Barnabas.*

Subject for the present year:—*How far have the Laws of the Jews been abrogated by the Christian Dispensation?*

PRIZE SUBJECTS, 1828.

The Vice Chancellor has issued the following notice:—

CHANCELLOR'S GOLD MEDALS.

[For the encouragement of English Poetry, to such resident Undergraduate as shall compose the best Ode, or the best Poem in heroic verse.]

Subject for the present year.

"The Invasion of Russia by Napoleon Buonaparte."

MEMBERS' PRIZES.

[Two prizes of fifteen guineas each, for the encouragement of Latin Prose composition, to be open to all Bachelors of Arts, without distinction of years, who are not of sufficient standing to take the degree of Master of Arts.]

[Two prizes of fifteen guineas each, to be open to all Undergraduates, who shall have resided not less than seven terms, at the time when the exercises are to be sent in.]

Subjects for the present year.

For the Bachelors,

De origine Scripturæ Alphabeticæ.

For the Undergraduates,

Quibus potissimum in rebus Hodierni ab Antiquis discrepent, et quas ob causas?

SIR W. BROWNE'S THREE GOLD MEDALS,

[Value five guineas each, to such resident Undergraduates as shall compose—

The best Greek Ode in imitation of Sappho:

The best Latin Ode in imitation of Horace:

The best Greek Epigram after the model of the Anthologia: and

The best Latin Epigram after the model of Martial:

Subjects for the present year:—

1. For the Greek Ode,

Ægyptus.

2. For the Latin Ode,

Hannibal.

3. For the Greek Epigram,

Ἐν δὲ πείρᾳ

τέλος διαφαίνεται, ὅν τις

ἔξοχότερος γένηται.—PINDAR.

4. For the Latin Epigram,

Πόλλ' ἠπίστατο ἔργα, κακῶς δ' ἠπίστατο πάντα.—HOMER.

PORSON PRIZE.

[The interest of 400*l.* stock, to be annually employed in the purchase of one or more Greek books, to be given to such resident Undergraduate as shall make the best translation of a proposed passage in Shakspeare, Ben Jonson, Massinger, or Beaumont and Fletcher, into Greek verse.]

Subject for the present year:—

Troilus and Cressida, Act III. Sc. 3.

Beginning—

"Time hath, my Lord, a wallet on his back," &c.

And ending—

"And drave great Mars to faction."

The metre to be *Tragicum Iambicum Trimeterum Acatalecticum*.

[These exercises are to be accentuated, and accompanied by a literal Latin prose version, and are to be sent in on or before April 30, 1823.]

DR. SMITH'S ANNUAL PRIZES.

[Of 25*l.* each, to the two best proficient in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy among the commencing Bachelors of Arts.]

Adjudged to

Charles Perry, Trinity College,

John Baily, St. John's College,

The first and second Wranglers.

NORRISIAN PRIZE.

Adjudged to

The Rev. W. M. Mayers, Catherine Hall.

Subject:—

The proofs of a general Judgment to come, and the advantages of the knowledge revealed to mankind concerning it.

SEATONIAN PRIZE.

Subject for the present year:—

Saul at Endor.

The Vice Chancellor has given notice that if any person on the above subject shall be considered by the Examiners to be entitled to distinguished commendation, a premium of 100*l.* shall be given instead of the usual sum of 40*l.*

CHANCELLOR'S GOLD MEDALS.

[For the two best proficient in Classical Learning among the Commencing Bachelors of Arts.]

Adjudged to

Mr. William Selwyn, St. John's College.

Mr. Thomas Williamson Peile, Trinity College.

HEBREW DISSERTATION.

Adjudged to

Alfred Addis, B.A. Trinity College.

LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS ON
Architectural and Cathedral Antiquities,
London, Normandy, &c.

London Edifices.

In Two Vols. Med. 8vo, price 5l. 5s.; Imp. 8vo, 8l. 8s.; 4to, with Proofs on India paper, 14l. 14s.

ARCHITECTURAL ILLUSTRATIONS of the PUBLIC BUILDINGS of LONDON; accompanied by Historical and Descriptive Accounts of each Edifice. By J. BRITTON, F.S.A., and A. PUGIN, Architect.

VOL. I., Dedicated, by permission, to the KING, contains 63 Engravings, and 368 pages of letter-press.

VOL. II., Dedicated, by permission, to PRINCE LEOPOLD, contains 81 Engravings, and 350 pages of letter-press.

This Work embraces ample Accounts and Illustrations of the Churches of ST. PAUL, WESTMINSTER ABBEY, ST. MARTIN, ST. STEPHEN, ST. BRIDE, ST. LUKE, CHELSEA, ST. PANCRAS, MARYLEBONE, the TEMPLE, &c.; also copious Historical and Descriptive Accounts and Engravings of all the LONDON THEATRES, all the BRIDGES, including the NEW LONDON, the TERRACES in Regent's Park, the BANK, the COUNCIL OFFICE, LAW COURTS, DIORAMA, COLOSSEUM, CARLTON HOUSE, SOMERSET HOUSE, COLLEGE of PHYSICIANS, both old and new, WESTMINSTER HALL, MANSION HOUSE; also of the Houses and Galleries of the MARQUESS OF UXBRIDGE, THOS. HOPE, Esq., JOHN SOANE, Esq., JOHN NASH, Esq., &c. &c.

The Historical and Descriptive Accounts are by JOS. GWILT, F.S.A., Architect; J. B. PAPWORTH, Architect; E. W. BRAYLEY, F.S.A.; J. BRITTON, F.S.A., &c.; C. DIBDIN, JUD.; W. H. LEEDS, &c.: and the Engravings are by J. LE KEUX, T. ROFFE, G. GLADWIN, &c.

* * For Critical Testimonies of this Work, see *Gentleman's Mag.* Aug. Sept. and Oct. 1827. *New Monthly Mag.* 1827. *Literary Gazette*, 1827.

PUGIN AND LE KEUX'S ENGRAVED SPECIMENS

OF THE

Architectural Antiquities of Normandy,

In Med. 4to, Six Guineas, and Ten Guineas Large Paper,

Consisting of Plans, Elevations, Views, &c. of several Edifices of that Province. Edited by JOHN BRITTON, F.S.A. &c.

This Publication consists of Eighty Engravings, elucidating the Characteristics and peculiar members of each Building. Besides serving to illustrate, architecturally and scientifically, the styles and varieties of the Ancient Buildings of Normandy, this Work tends to exemplify the variations between the early Architecture of that Country and of England; and thus furnishes data for the Critical Antiquary, and Practical Examples for the Architect.

The Plates are wholly engraved by J. and H. LE KEUX; and represent the Ecclesiastical Architecture of the Churches of *Abbaye aux Hommes*, and *Abbaye aux Dames*; *St. Nicholas* and *Than* at Caen; *St. Ouen* and *St. Vincent* at Rouen; the *Cathedral at Bayeux*; the Domestic Architecture of *Palais de Justice*, *Hôtel de Bouthrould*, and *Archbishop's Palace* at Rouen; and the *Chateau Fontaine le Henri*, near Caen, &c.

Interior Architecture, &c.

The UNION of ARCHITECTURE, SCULPTURE, and PAINTING, exemplified in a Series of Twenty-three Engravings and Six Wood-cuts, with descriptive Accounts of the HOUSE of JOHN SOANE. By JOHN BRITTON, F.S.A.

This Volume contains much original disquisition on the best Designs for, and most appropriate Styles of, fitting up Modern Mansions, Galleries, &c.; also on the *Belzoni Sarcophagus*, Hogarth's Pictures, &c. Price 2l. 2s. med. 4to.; 3l. 3s. imp. 4to.

* * See *Monthly Review* for Dec. 1827. *Gent.'s Mag.* Aug. 1827. *New Monthly Mag.* Sept. 1827. *Literary Chron.* June 1827. *The Times*, Aug. 1827.

Cathedral Antiquities.

By JOHN BRITTON, F.S.A., &c. &c.

For a liberal and learned review of this Work, the reader is referred to the "*Quarterly Review*" for September 1826; in which it is stated, that "the task which Browne Willis left imperfect has been undertaken by Mr. Britton, who has contributed more than any other person to the illustration of our Architectural Antiquities." The "*Theological Review*," for December 1825, in an able and discriminating Essay on Ancient and Modern Architecture and Architects, says, "unbiassed by party, Mr. Britton has calmly examined the *Cathedrals* in succession, giving to each the emotions justly proportioned to it, and no more. The engravings of these volumes are for the most part of the highest order, and made from drawings by artists whose names stand in the first rank as architectural draftsmen."

1. THE HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES OF SALISBURY CATHEDRAL, contains 31 Engravings by J. and H. LE KEUX, &c. from Drawings by MACKENZIE, &c. and 3 Wood-cuts; also 114 Pages of Letter-press.—3*l.* 3*s.* Medium 4*to.*—5*l.* 5*s.* Imperial 4*to.*

2. THE HISTORY, &c. OF NORWICH CATHEDRAL, consists of 24 Engravings by the same Artists, and 94 Pages of Letter-press.—2*l.* 10*s.* Medium 4*to.*—4*l.* 4*s.* Imperial 4*to.*

3. THE HISTORY, &c. OF WINCHESTER CATHEDRAL, consists of 142 Pages of Letter-press, and 30 Engravings, from Drawings by EDWARD BLORE, Esq. Architect. Same prices as Salisbury.

4. THE HISTORY, &c. OF THE METROPOLITICAL CHURCH OF YORK, is illustrated by 34 Engravings, from Drawings by E. BLORE and F. MACKENZIE.—3*l.* 12*s.* Medium 4*to.*—6*l.* Imperial 4*to.*

5. THE HISTORY, &c. of LICHFIELD CATHEDRAL; illustrated by 16 Engravings, by the same Artists, from Drawings by F. MACKENZIE, &c. and 74 Pages of Letter-press.—1*l.* 18*s.* Medium 4*to.*—3*l.* 3*s.* Imperial 4*to.*

6. THE HISTORY, &c. OF OXFORD CATHEDRAL; with 11 Engravings by J. LE KEUX, &c. from Drawings by MACKENZIE and CATTERMOLÉ.—1*l.* 4*s.* Medium 4*to.*—2*l.* 2*s.* Imperial 4*to.*

7. THE HISTORY, &c. OF THE CATHEDRAL OF CANTERBURY; illustrated by 26 Engravings by J. LE KEUX, SANDS, &c. from Drawings by EDWARD CRESY, Esq. F.S.A., G. L. TAYLOR, Esq. F.S.A., Architects, and G. CATTERMOLÉ.—3*l.* 3*s.* Medium 4*to.*—5*l.* 5*s.* Imperial 4*to.*

8. THE HISTORY OF WELLS CATHEDRAL, illustrated by 22 Engravings by J. and H. LE KEUX, &c. —Medium 4*to.* 2*l.* 10*s.*—Imperial 4*to.* 4*l.* 4*s.*

9. THE HISTORY, &c. OF EXETER CATHEDRAL, contains 156 Pages of Letter-press, and is illustrated by 22 Engravings, from very elaborate Drawings.—2*l.* 10*s.* Medium 4*to.*—4*l.* 4*s.* Imperial 4*to.*—See *Monthly Review*, Dec. 1827.

10. PETERBOROUGH CATHEDRAL; to be comprised in Three Numbers, with 16 Engravings, will follow, and be completed in March 1828, when the First Number of GLOUCESTER CATHEDRAL will appear, with Six Engravings, by J. LE KEUX.

"In the letter-press of the above Works, the Author has endeavoured to give a condensed and perspicuous narrative of all the principal events connected with the Cathedrals, has pointed out the different styles, eras, and characteristic features of the architecture of each, and has also given a few biographical anecdotes of the different prelates. The chronological lists of bishops, kings, deans, and dates of building different parts of the churches, the Author hopes will be found useful and gratifying to the antiquary."—*Preface.*

* * Of the above Works a *small Number* of Copies are printed on SUPER-ROYAL Folio, with Proofs, and with Proofs and Etchings of the Plates.

Detailed Prospectuses, with Wood-cuts, of the above Works may be had of the Publishers.

Pugin's Gothic Architecture.

SPECIMENS of GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE; selected from various Ancient Edifices in England: consisting of Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Parts at large; calculated to exemplify the various Styles, and the Practical Construction of this Class of admired Architecture. Accompanied by Historical and Descriptive Accounts.

The Drawings by A. PUGIN, Architect; and the Engravings, in Outline, by J. LE KEUX, TURREL, &c. The Literary Part by E. J. WILLSON.—Vol. I. contains Sixty Engravings, with a Glossary of Technical Terms. Vol. II. Fifty-six Prints. The Two Vols. Medium 4to. Six Guineas, and Nine Guineas Imperial 4to.

* * This Work is adapted to furnish practical Information to the Architect, Builder, Cabinet Maker, &c. also to the Critical Antiquary and Connoisseur.

North Wiltshire.

In one Volume 8vo, price 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*; and Large Paper, with Proofs, 2*l.* 6*s.* extra Boards,

TOPOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES of NORTH WILTSHIRE; comprising Accounts of the Antiquities, Towns, Seats, &c. of the Northern Parts of the County. With a Map and Thirty Engravings;—also an Auto-Biographic Sketch of the Author. By J. BRITTON, F.S.A. &c.

[“Mr. Britton's *Life* is one of usefulness—an example to the industrious, a stimulus to the young, in every rank of society, who may be ambitious to tread the paths of literature with honour to themselves and benefit to the public.”—*Literary Gazette*, October 1825.]

* * This Volume, with Title-page, &c. as the Third of “THE BEAUTIES of WILTSHIRE.” 1*l.* 4*s.* small, and 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.* large.

Architectural Antiquities.

In 4 Vols. Med. 4to, Twenty Guineas; Large Paper, 32*l.*

The ARCHITECTURAL ANTIQUITIES of GREAT BRITAIN; consisting of 278 Engravings of Castles, Churches, Old Mansions, Crosses, &c. with Historical and Descriptive Accounts of each Subject. By J. BRITTON, F.S.A., &c. &c.

“Mr. Britton stands conspicuous among the labourers on the more liberal and pleasing tracts of antiquarianism. He has long been contributing largely to the gratification of a national taste for what may be called the monuments of past ages. With respect to the Plates it would not be easy to find any language too emphatical in praise. Nothing more exquisite has been seen, or can be conceived, than the execution of the greater number of them.”—*Eclectic Review*, May 1816.

The fifth Volume of this Work contains 86 Engravings, mostly by J. Le Keux, which, with the historical and descriptive letter-press, are arranged in *chronological order*, shewing the rise, progress, and perfection of *Christian Architecture* in England. Also, *Chronological and Historical Tables of Churches, Crosses, Fonts, Monuments, &c.*; with an *Architectural Dictionary*.

The HISTORY and ILLUSTRATION of REDCLIFFE CHURCH, BRISTOL. With Twelve Engravings. Royal 8vo. 16*s.*; Imp. 4to. 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*

The HISTORY and ANTIQUITIES of BATH ABBEY CHURCH. With Ten Engravings. By J. and H. LE KEUX, &c.

“Not many weeks ago we had to speak, and in the most favourable terms, of the History of Wells Cathedral; and we can now do little else than repeat our praises upon this twin volume, descriptive of the twin Abbey at Bath. We find the same antiquarian research, the same indefatigable industry in examining and representing every interesting fragment, the same tempered zeal in estimating the value of traditions, and the same laborious beauty and finish in the engravings.”—*Literary Gazette*, April 1825.

Royal 8vo. 1*l.*—Medium 4to. 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*—Imperial 4to. Two Guineas.

Robson's Views of English Cities.

In Med. 4to. extra bds. 4l. 4s.; Imp. 4to. 8l.; Proofs and Etchings, 16l. 16s.

PICTURESQUE VIEWS of the ENGLISH CITIES. From Drawings by G. T. ROBSON.

This Volume contains Thirty-one Engravings, representing distant picturesque Views of all the English Cities, from points in which the *Cathedral* forms the principal feature. The Artist has also endeavoured to delineate all the prominent objects of each City, and of its immediate vicinity, and has represented the same under the varied effects of meridian sunshine, cloudy and dark skies, sun-rise, sun-set, twilight, rainbow, &c. The Engravings are executed in line, by J. Le Keux, Woolnoth, Varrall, Redaway, Tomblason, Jeavons, Barrenger, &c.

An elaborate, novel, and elegantly engraved title-page, by Woolnoth, with Views of the Cathedrals of York, Canterbury, Lichfield, Salisbury, Exeter, and Durham; also the Armorial Bearings of all the Sees; likewise a printed title-page, with wood-cut, border, and an Address by the Editor, precede the volume.

Edited and Published by J. BRITTON, F.S.A., &c.

For *Critical Testimonies* the reader is referred to the *New Monthly Magazine*, September 1827—*Literary Gazette*, April and September 1827—The *Literary Chronicle*, 1827—and *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1823.

PREPARING FOR PUBLICATION,

PICTURESQUE ANTIQUITIES of the ENGLISH CITIES; consisting of a Series of Prints, illustrating the most interesting Ancient Buildings, Architectural and Sculptured Fragments, Street Scenery, &c. of all the Cities of England; accompanied by Historical and Descriptive Accounts of each Subject, as well as of the popular Characteristics of every Place.

By JOHN BRITTON, F.S.A., M.R.S.L., &c.

As supplementary to, and elucidatory of, the above Views, this publication is announced. Materials for it have long been preparing, and the Author has only to specify some of these to shew the class of subjects and nature of the Work which he has projected.

The CITY OF YORK, for instance, presents many singular features and objects in its architectural remains. Not only the street scenery, but the fortified gates, or bars, the dungeon-keep, or castle, the embattled walls, with bastion towers, are peculiar, indigenous, and picturesque; and cannot fail of being eminently interesting to the artist, the antiquary, and the historian. All these will be faithfully and forcibly delineated, whilst the historical and local anecdotes, as well as the architectural peculiarities of each, will afford abundant matter for antiquarian and critical disquisition. The First Number will be devoted to this City, and it is presumed will amply exemplify the above remarks.

Every other City offers its distinctive architectural and natural features, and each involves historical and local characteristics, which are not merely interesting to the provincial antiquary, but to most readers of laudable curiosity.

It is proposed to publish this work in Six Portions, or Numbers, each of which will include at least Ten Engravings and Four Wood-cuts. Two of the former to be finished in imitation of those in the preceding Work, whilst the other eight will be executed in such styles of etching and finishing as may seem best adapted to exemplify the effects and details of the respective subjects. The Author refers to his volumes on *Bath Abbey Church*, p. 69, and *Wells Cathedral*, p. 91, to shew the style and manner he proposes to adopt in describing the Cities; added to which, will be brief but apposite accounts of the *Picturesque Antiquities* of each.

LONDON:

J. MOYES, TOOK'S COURT, CHANCERY LANE.

April, 1828.

BIBLICAL ENCYCLOPÆDIA.

Just Published in Quarto, with Twenty-Four Plates, and a fine Engraved Portrait of Calmet, (now for the first time given,) Part 1, Price 24s. in Boards, of

The **FIFTH EDITION**, revised and greatly improved, with a New and Copious Index, of

CALMET'S DICTIONARY OF THE HOLY BIBLE,

WITH THE FRAGMENTS OF THE LATE MR. C. TAYLOR;

A Series of valuable Dissertations, containing entirely new Illustrations of Scripture Incidents and Expressions, selected from the most Authentic Historians, Travellers, &c.

ILLUSTRATED BY SEVERAL HUNDRED PLATES.

* * For the convenience of Purchasers, the Work may also be had, done up in Monthly Parts, Price 6s. each.

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY B. J. HOLDSWORTH, 18, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD;

And may be had of WAUGH and INNES, EDINBURGH; W. CURRY, Jun. and Co. DUBLIN; and all Booksellers.

AT a period of time so long subsequent to its original publication, and after it has been placed by universal consent at the head of Biblical Encyclopædias, it would be superfluous to expatiate upon the composition or character of CALMET'S DICTIONARY OF THE HOLY BIBLE. Whether we regard the extent and variety of its information, or the profound and enlightened tone of its criticism, it stands unrivalled in that important and interesting branch of literature to which it belongs.

In the *Fourth Edition* of this work, which the indefatigable Editor Mr. C. Taylor, just lived to conduct through the press, many and important alterations were made, and much new matter was introduced. The supplementary additions, before detached from the text, were incorporated with their respective articles; the Astronomical and Geographical Excursions were greatly augmented; and a mass of illustrative information derived from a new and satisfactory source—ANCIENT COINS—was for the first time presented to the notice of the Biblical Student. In a publication so extensive, it could not reasonably be expected that a *first* edition—for so we must consider the *fourth* with reference to the improved character of the work—should be free from defects, or that its general character should be unsusceptible of improvement. The reverse has been found to be the case; and had the worthy Editor lived to prepare another edition for the press, there is every reason to believe that he would have added something, corrected much, and have altered in some particulars his arrangement.

In the **FIFTH EDITION**, to which the attention of the public is now respectfully solicited, every effort has been made to secure the accuracy and extend the usefulness of the work. The references and quotations, amounting to many thousands, have been verified and corrected—the *explanations of the plates*, hitherto detached from the body of the work, to the great inconvenience of the reader, *have been incorporated with the articles of which they form an integral part*—the whole of the text has passed under a diligent revision—AND SEVERAL ENTIRELY NEW ARTICLES, as well as occasional additions, have been introduced. To the whole will be added, a new and copious index, embracing every subject treated of in the work, as well as the several texts of Scripture illustrated and explained. The

Plates (in this New Edition) have been carefully revised; and it is the intention of the Publisher to give such additional Plates as may be found necessary to the improvement of the Work. The whole to be completed in Thirty-four Parts.

The Editor of the Fifth Edition, now in the course of publication, takes this opportunity to acknowledge his obligations to several gentlemen who have favoured him with hints and suggestions for the improvement of the work, and to solicit similar assistance from others who may feel disposed to further his exertions, in completing a publication which may be rendered eminently contributive to the interests of Biblical literature.

The following EXTRACT from the Scientific Analysis, will show the numerous subjects treated of in this Biblical Encyclopædia:—

I. LITERATURE.—Language — Grammar — Rhetoric — Criticism— Learning—Bibliography.

II. COSMOGRAPHY.—Geography—Meteorology—Astrography.

III. THEOLOGY.—Introductory — The Divine Being — Created Beings—Institutions—Idolatry.

IV. NATURAL SCIENCE.—Geology — Botany — Biography.

V. MANUFACTURES.—Food—Raiment.

VI. ARTS.—Agriculture—Architecture—Music—Writing.

VII. SCIENCES.—Arithmetic—Natural Philosophy—Moral Philosophy—Medicine—Jurisprudence.

VIII. HISTORY.—Chronology—Biography—Antiquities.

††† The *Complete Scientific Analysis of Calmet*, with the Prospectus, may be had Gratis.

CHARACTER OF THIS WORK.

“It is certainly a work without which no library can be complete, and with which few other books, explanatory of Scripture, can be required; since it comprehends every thing that has either a proximate or remote reference to the sacred writings. To the Orientalist, to the Biblical scholar, to the general reader, and, more especially to the minister of the Gospel, (for we omitted to mention that an Index of Texts and subjects incidentally illustrated, is added to the fourth volume,) it presents an inexhaustible fund of instruction, while to all it supplies amusement of the most elevated kind.”—*New Monthly Magazine*, November, 1827.

“CALMET’S DICTIONARY has always been in great and deserved estimation, and the public is much obliged to the Editor of the present publication for re-printing it in a form more convenient to general purchasers, and more useful in itself. The additional illustrations to this edition appear to be *INGENIOUS and IMPORTANT*.”—*British Critic*.

“Calmet’s Dictionary of the Bible is, in itself, a work which no Biblical scholar would like to be without; BUT ITS MERERE-PUBLICATION WOULD HAVE BEEN EXTREMELY UNACCEPTABLE. As a whole, the Work in ITS PRESENT FORM is an invaluable treasury of Biblical lore, and a stupendous monument of literary industry.”—*Eclectic Review*, Vol. XXII. p. 455.

DR. MANT has made great use of Calmet in the Notes to his Bible, published by the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge: and in his list of books to which he acknowledges obligations, particularly specifies the “FRAGMENTS” annexed to this Edition of Calmet.

“A translation of this truly valuable Work, with occasional remarks, was published in 1742, in three folio volumes; which having become extremely scarce, an edition was published in 1801, in two thick quarto volumes, by Mr. Taylor, with a volume of Additions from books of voyages and travels, &c. under the title of “FRAGMENTS.” A new edition, enlarged and greatly improved, is now publishing. The work is pleasingly illustrated with numerous engravings, which convey an accurate idea of Oriental manners and customs. CALMET’S DICTIONARY IS THE BASIS OF ALL SIMILAR MODERN WORKS OF THE LIKE KIND.”—*Horne’s Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*, Vol. 2. p. 746. Fifth Edition.

* * * See also Monthly Review, Monthly Magazine, &c. &c.

An enlarged Index of Subjects and Texts to the Fourth Edition, is now published, and may be had separately, price 5s.

BOOKS

Published by B. J. Holdsworth, 18, St. Paul's Church Yard.

1.

The **LIFE and OPINIONS** of **JOHN DE WYCLIFFE, D. D.** illustrated principally from his unpublished Manuscripts, with a preliminary View of the Papal System, and of the State of the Protestant Doctrine in Europe to the commencement of the Fourteenth Century. By **ROBERT VAUGHAN.** With a finely engraved Portrait by E. H. Finden, from the original picture by Sir Antonio More, now an Heirloom to the Rectory of Wycliffe, Richmondshire. 2 vols. 8vo. price 21s. nearly ready.

This Work has been composed after a careful examination of the numerous Wycliffe manuscripts in the libraries of Oxford and Cambridge, in the British Museum, Lambeth Palace, and Trinity College, Dublin. It is designed to present a complete view of the life and times of our patriarch reformer; and will include analytical notices of nearly the whole of his writings.

2.

ELEMENTS OF MENTAL AND MORAL SCIENCE, designed to exhibit the Original Susceptibilities of the Mind, and the Rule by which the Rectitude of any of its States and Feelings should be judged. By **GEORGE PAYNE, A. M.** 8vo. 12s. Just Published.

3.

The **BARN and the STEEPLE.** 12mo. Price 5s. Just Published.

"For the stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it."—Habakuk ii. 11.

4.

SCHLEUSNER'S NEW TESTAMENT LEXICON, compressed into the form of a Manual; comprising the whole of his explanations and Scripture references, and retaining every thing necessary for the usual purposes of consulting. By **J. CAREY, LL.D.** 8vo. Price 14s.

* * The above (Carey's Schleusner) contains nearly all that is in the Original Work published at 3l. with the exception of the references to the Bible not being in full.

5.

ALLBUT'S ELEMENTS of **USEFUL KNOWLEDGE,** in Geography, Astronomy, Botany, Geology, Chronology, Natural Philosophy, and other Sciences, 14th edition, revised and much improved. With eight superior engravings. 12mo. Price 4s. 6d. neatly half-bound.

"Such a work as this,—an Encyclopædia to a youthful mind—would have been to us a treasury of delight had we met with it in our boyish days, and we therefore feel it a duty to commend the present revised edition of an excellent compilation to the notice of Parents and Teachers."—*Elec. Rev.* July 1827.

6.

The **WIDOW'S TALE,** and other **POEMS.** By **BERNARD BARTON,** Author of "Devotional Verses." 12mo. 5s. 6d.

"We should always rejoice to see this volume on any table." *Literary Gazette,* March, 1827.

"This interesting little Volume contains some of the sweetest poetry Mr. Barton has ever written." *Literary Magnet,* April, 1827.

7.

Dedicated to the Bishop of Chester.

The **WHOLE WORKS** of **EDWARD REYNOLDS, D. D.** Lord Bishop of Norwich. Now first collected. With a Life of the Author, by **ALEXANDER CHALMERS, Esq.** and finely engraved Portrait, 6 vols. 8vo. 3l.

The present edition of the Works of Bishop Reynolds, forms a most valuable accession to our stores of sound and masculine theology. It is but just to add, that though carefully and handsomely printed, its price is extremely moderate."—*Christian Remembrancer,* Nov. 1826.

8.

SERMONS Doctrinal and Practical, elucidating the Duty of Studying Prophecy, &c. By the Rev. **JOHN NOBLE COLEMAN, M. A.** late of Queen's College, Oxford. 8vo. Price 12s.

9.

HISTORY of the **TRANSMISSION** of **ANCIENT BOOKS** to Modern Times; or, a Concise Account of the Means by which the Genuineness and Authenticity of Ancient Historical Works are ascertained. By **ISAAC TAYLOR, Jun.** 8vo. 8s.

"Mr. Taylor is deserving of much praise for the publication of this volume: his design is comprehensive; his arrangement clear; and his treatment of the several topics that engage him, at once concise and satisfactory."—*Monthly Rev.* Sept. 1827.

10.

ELEMENTS of **THOUGHT,** or, First Lessons in the Knowledge of the Mind. By **ISAAC TAYLOR, Jun.** 12mo. Second edition, revised and enlarged. 4s. 6d.

11.

MORELL'S, (Rev. T.) ELEMENTS of the **HISTORY** of **PHILOSOPHY** and **SCIENCE,** from the earliest Authentic Records to the Commencement of the Eighteenth Century. 1 vol. 8vo. 12s.

"It is an elaborate useful abstract of such large books as Stanley and Enfield's History of Philosophy, and one book may comprise all that is wanted to be known; and the work before us will answer the purpose."—*Gent. Mag.* Jan. 1828.

* * Also by the same Author, **STUDIES IN HISTORY,** consisting of the History of England, Rome, and Greece, 4 vols. 12mo. 21s. Either History may be had separately.

12.

The **EARLY LIFE** of **CHRIST,** an Example to the Young. By the Rev. **HENRY MARCH.** Author of *Sabbaths at Home.* 12mo. 4s. boards.

13.

REVIEWS: by the Rev. **ROBERT HALL, A. M.** Now first collected in one vol. 8vo. price 5s. Third edition.

14.

CHRISTIAN MEMORIALS of the Nineteenth Century, or Select Evangelical Biography, for the last twenty-five Years. By the Rev. **ALFRED BISHOP,** 12mo. Price 6s.

* * In this Work will be found the Memoirs of above Forty eminent individuals of both sexes; and a Work better suited for a present to young people, or for a Sunday-School Library, cannot well be found.

15.

CABINET LIBRARY OF DIVINITY. By the Rev. Dr. WILSON, consisting of Selections from the Works of Leighton, Owen, Hopkins, and Howe. 6 vols. 18mo. Price 18s. Either volume may be had separate. Price 3s.

* * Also Selections from the Works of Bishop Hall. The Expositor of Dr. Doddridge. The Miscellaneous Works of Dr. Doddridge; and Watts and Cowper in one volume. Price 3s. each, boards, or 3s. 6d. done up in a superior way and lettered.

16.

MEMOIRS including Correspondence and other Remains of Mr. JOHN URQUHART, late of the University of St. Andrews. By the Rev. W. ORME. 2 vols. 12mo. Second Edition. Price 10s. boards, with a Portrait, and Prefatory Letter of Dr. CHALMERS.

"We very much doubt if there existed his equal among the churches of Great Britain, either in theological science or practical piety; and certainly for the extraordinary assemblage of genius, learning, theology, and holy zeal, it may be long before we shall hear of such another." *Congregational Magazine*. November, 1827.

17.

The BLASPHEMY AGAINST the HOLY SPIRIT, and the Doctrine of Spiritual Influence, considered in several Discourses, with Notes and Illustrations. By W. ORME. 12mo. Price 5s.

* * Also a Defence of the Missions in the South Sea Islands, against the misrepresentations contained in the Quarterly Review. By W. ORME. 8vo. Price 3s. 6d.

For character of this Reply, see *Christian Observer*, October 1827, page 639.

18.

ELEMENTS OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM and INTERPRETATION, with special reference to the New Testament. Translated from the Latin of Ernesti, &c. and accompanied with notes. By MOSES STUART, of Andover, America. Re-published, with additional observations. By E. HENDERSON, Author of "Biblical Researches and Travels in Russia," &c. 12mo. Price 4s.

"It is small in size but rich in value; containing the substance of many ample volumes compressed into the least possible compass. *Methodist Magazine*, fine edition, Oct. 1827.

19.

DOMESTIC PREACHER, or Short Discourses from the MSS. of some eminent Ministers. 2 vols. 12mo. price 8s.

"We hardly know where we could direct our readers to a series of sermons in so small a compass, that embrace so great a variety of subjects, or that exhibit so much purity of evangelical sentiment, chasteness of style, and felicity of illustration."

New Baptist Magazine, April.

20.

The LIFE of the Rev. PHILIP HENRY, A.M. By the Rev. MATTHEW HENRY, V. D. M. Enlarged with important additions, Notes, &c. by J. B. WILLIAMS, F.A.S. 1 vol. 8vo. 15s. with Portraits.

The additions and illustrations sufficiently attest the merits of the editor's performance, and recommend the volume to the attention of our readers as a valuable accession to every religious library."

Eclectic, April.

21.

The Eighth Edition of
ESSAYS, in a Series of Letters on DECISION OF CHARACTER, &c. By JOHN FOSTER. 8vo. Price 10s.

The Rev. T. F. Dibdin, in page 87 of his 'Library Companion,' has the following observation: "Mr. Foster's Essays are full of ingenuity and original remark. The style of them is at once terse and elegant."

* * Also by the same Author, **AN ESSAY ON THE EVILS OF POPULAR IGNORANCE**. 8vo. Second Edition. Price 12s.

22.

FOUR DISCOURSES on the Sacrifice, Priesthood, Atonement, and Redemption of Christ. By J. P. SMITH, D.D. 8vo. Price 8s.

23.

SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY to the MESSIAH; an Inquiry with a view to a Satisfactory Determination of the Doctrines taught in the Holy Scriptures concerning the person of Christ. By J. P. SMITH, D.D. 3 vols. 8vo. price 1l. 14s.

"Unquestionably the most elaborate defence and proof of the deity of Jesus Christ extant in our language" *Horne's Introduction to the Study of the Bible*, vol. ii. Appen. p. 115.

24.

ORIENTAL OBSERVATIONS and OCCASIONAL CRITICISMS, illustrating several hundred passages of Scripture. By JOHN CALLAWAY, late Missionary in Ceylon. 12mo. price 2s. 6d.

25.

SKETCHES of (400) SERMONS, on some of the most interesting Passages of Holy Writ: preached to Congregations of the United Kingdom, and on the European Continent. *Furnished by their respective Authors*. 8 vols. 12mo. Third Edition. With an Index of Texts, &c. Price 1l. 12s.; or any volume separate, 4s.

"The occasional introduction of Sermons suited to the seasons, and important providential events, will not, it is hoped, be unacceptable to those for whom this publication is principally designed."

26.

A VOCABULARY to the **ŒDIPUS REX of SOPHOCLES**; containing the English signification, composition, and derivation of the words, with figures of reference to the text, and occasional explanations, on the plan of the Charterhouse Vocabularies, for the use of Schools. By G. HUGHES, M. A. 12mo. 2s. 6d. bound.

The above play is edited by Brunck, in Greek, with a Latin translation, may be had of B. J. H. price 3s.

27.

A GENERAL INDEX to the Fourth Edition of CALMET'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, and THE FRAGMENTS: comprising an alphabetical List of Subjects, and a methodical Arrangement of Texts, illustrated and explained: to which is prefixed, a scientific Analysis, or general outline of the Work. 4to. Price 5s.



AMICABLE SOCIETY,
FOR THE
Insurance of Lives,

SERJEANT'S INN, FLEET STREET,

INCORPORATED BY

Charter of Queen Anne, 1706.

HIS MAJESTY having been graciously pleased, on the Report of the Law Officers of the Crown, further to encourage the Plan of this Society, by His ROYAL CHARTER, bearing date the 12th day of February 1823, authorizing the Extension of the Insurances therein to any number not exceeding 16,000 Persons or Shares, (the number of 8000 to which the Society was limited by the Charter of the 48th of King Geo. III. being then full)—the DIRECTORS have now to offer to the attention of the Public, TABLES of RATES, (as annexed) for the INSURANCE of LIVES, at the various Ages from Eight to Seventy-two; either for the whole of Life; or any specific number of Years; the contingency of one Person surviving another; or for the joint-continuance of the Lives of two or more Persons, the Insurance payable on the Death of either.

INSURANCES in this Office are effected in certain cases at a reduction of nearly 20 per cent. and on the whole on terms greatly favourable to the Insured.

POLICIES may be effected from £200 to £5000; and every kind of INSURANCE, however short the continuance, is entitled to a participation in the pecuniary advantages accruing to the Corporation. These advantages are wholly appropriated to the Benefit of the Insured, in proportion to the amount of each Insurance.*

TABLES may be had at the Office, where attendance is given from Nine till Three o'Clock.

By Order of the Court of Directors,
JOHN PENSAM, Registrar.

In the last year, Insurances on 255½ Shares became Claims, and are now in course of payment at £236 : 7s per Share, being on 74 Shares admitted under a guarantee of £150 per Share, £57 10s per cent.; on 4 Shares admitted under a guarantee of £160 per Share, £47 14s per cent.; on 27 Shares admitted under a guarantee of £170 per Share, £39 per cent.; on 9 Shares admitted under a guarantee of £180 per Share, £31 : 6s per cent.; and on 141½ Shares admitted under the present guaranteed sum of £200 per Share, £18 3s 6d per cent. in addition to the amount originally insured.

AMICABLE SOCIETY for Insurance of Lives, *Serjeant's Inn,* *Fleet Street; incorporated by QUEEN ANNE 1706.*

TABLES of RATES PER CENT. PER ANNUM.

Age.	For One Year			For Seven Years.			For the whole Life.			For One Year			For Seven Years.			For the whole Life.			
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	
8 to 14	0	14	6	0	18	0	1	14	6	34	1	9	6	1	11	6	2	15	6
15	0	15	0	0	19	0	1	15	6	35	1	10	0	1	12	0	2	17	0
16	0	15	6	1	0	0	1	16	6	36	1	10	6	1	13	0	2	18	6
17	0	17	0	1	1	0	1	17	6	37	1	11	0	1	14	0	3	0	0
18	0	18	6	1	2	0	1	18	6	38	1	11	6	1	15	0	3	1	6
19	1	1	0	1	3	6	1	19	6	39	1	12	0	1	16	0	3	3	0
20	1	1	6	1	4	6	2	0	6	40	1	13	0	1	17	0	3	5	0
21	1	2	6	1	5	0	2	1	6	41	1	14	0	1	18	0	3	7	0
22	1	3	6	1	5	6	2	2	6	42	1	15	0	1	19	0	3	9	0
23	1	4	0	1	6	0	2	3	6	43	1	16	0	2	0	0	3	11	0
24	1	4	6	1	6	6	2	4	6	44	1	17	0	2	1	0	3	13	0
25	1	5	0	1	7	0	2	5	6	45	1	18	0	2	2	0	3	15	0
26	1	5	6	1	7	6	2	6	6	46	1	19	0	2	3	0	3	17	6
27	1	6	0	1	8	0	2	7	6	47	2	0	0	2	4	6	4	0	0
28	1	6	6	1	8	6	2	8	6	48	2	1	6	2	6	0	4	2	6
29	1	7	0	1	9	0	2	9	6	49	2	3	0	2	8	0	4	5	0
30	1	7	6	1	9	6	2	10	6	50	2	4	6	2	10	0	4	8	0
31	1	8	0	1	10	0	2	11	6	51	2	6	0	2	12	0	4	11	0
32	1	8	6	1	10	6	2	12	6	52	2	7	6	2	14	0	4	14	0
33	1	9	0	1	11	0	2	14	0	53	2	9	6	2	16	0	4	17	0

JUST PUBLISHED,

BY BALDWIN AND CRADOCK, PATERNOSTER ROW, AND
W. PICKERING, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON,

*In two very large Volumes, Royal 4to. price 6l. 16s. 6d.
in canvas boards,*

TOTIUS LATINITATIS LEXICON,

CONSILIO ET CURA

JACOBI FACCIOLATI,

OPERA ET STUDIO

ÆGIDII FORCELLINI,

ALUMNI SEMINARII PATAVINI, LUCUBRATUM,

EDIDIT;

ANGLICAM INTERPRETATIONEM IN LOCUM ITALICÆ SUBSTITUIT;
APPENDICEM PATAVINAM LEXICO PASSIM INTERTEXUIT;
PAUCA DE SUO, DISTINCTIONE PER OBELOS FACTA,
HUC ATQUE ILLUC SPARSIT;

AUCTARIUM DENIQUE, ET HORATHI TURSSELLINI DE PARTICULIS
LATINÆ ORATIONIS LIBELLUM, ETIAM GERRARDI SIGLARIUM
ROMANUM, ET GESNERI INDICEM ETYMOLOGICUM,

ADJECIT

JACOBUS BAILEY, A.M.

Regiæ Societatis Literarum Socius.

“This celebrated Dictionary was founded on that of
Calepini, edited by Facciolati, and published at Padua in
1718, which, owing to its superior merits, justly super-
seded all the preceding works of the same kind in Italy.
Forcellini being introduced to the notice of Cardinal Cor-

naro, bishop of Padua, received from that prelate an order to compile a new Latin Dictionary, in which all the deficiencies of the preceding edition of Calepini's performance should be supplied. Perhaps no person was better qualified for such an undertaking, or was possessed of more steadiness, patience, or perseverance; an almost incredible proof of which is, that he employed in it nearly forty years of his life! He ransacked not only all the Latin writers of the several ages of Roman literature, but all the ancient grammarians, and every collection of inscriptions which had been published to his time. To each of the Latin words inserted in this new Dictionary he affixed corresponding Italian and Greek, and to render it still more complete, he subjoined to it a copious list of barbarous words, and a numerous catalogue of the writers whose works he had investigated. The performance was soon considered classical and unrivalled."—*Chalmers's Biographical Dict. Art. Forcellini*. Authorities—*Fabroni Vita Italorum*, and *Baldwin's Literary Journal*.

Brunet, in his *Manuel du Libraire*, says, "Cet ouvrage, regardé comme le meilleur Dictionnaire Latin que nous avons, est très recherché.

And the Edinburgh Reviewers, in their critique on Hill's Latin Synonymes, say, "The last century, above all, produced the Thesaurus of Gesner and of Facciolati; works of so comprehensive a nature, and executed with such indefatigable industry, that it may not be too much, perhaps, to assert, that if every other book on this subject had perished, these two alone might have supplied all the materials for an excellent treatise on Latin Synonymes."

The Delegates of the Clarendon Press were so deeply impressed with the merits and general utility of this Dictionary, that they had resolved to put forth a new edition and only abandoned the undertaking on finding themselves anticipated by the present.

Messrs. BALDWIN and CRADOCK, and Mr. PICKERING, beg to inform the Public that they have purchased the impression and copyright of this very valuable Work of the assignees of Mr. Richard Priestly, who, from the pressure of circumstances arising from the general commercial derangement which unfortunately took place at the beginning of the year 1826, has been deprived of the advantages which he had a right to expect from this meritorious, but immense undertaking; though the honour of having completed what was such a desideratum to the student of Latinity cannot be taken from him. The lamentable circumstance here alluded to enables the present publishers to offer the work at a price not only within the reach of every scholastic establishment, but of almost every individual who makes the Latin language his study: being less than two-thirds of what the original projector must have sold it at to have produced him a fair profit on the very large capital advanced. This price is 6*l.* 16*s.* 6*d.*

Besides rendering the Italian significations into English, and thoroughly revising the whole work, Mr. Bailey has incorporated the valuable Appendix of Cognolatus; and has thus offered, to such of his countrymen as are desirous of obtaining a perfect knowledge of the Latin language, the most acceptable present that could have been bestowed.

A few copies of the work were circulated before the event took place, which has hitherto suspended the sale; but, in the interval, very valuable and important additions have been made by the dilligence and learning of the Editor, in three other Appendices: viz. the very useful work of Tursellinus on the Particles of the Latin language; Gerrard's Siglarium Romanum; and Gesner's Etymological Index.

